

The Slavic and East European Journal

Vol. XV, No. 2

Summer 1957

CONTENTS

PART ONE

- A Note on Internal Soviet Propaganda Alfred Senn 83
- Form and Thematic Unity in
Karel Čapek's Trilogy William E. Harkins 92
- Toward an Analysis of Boris Pasternak Helen Muchnic 101
- The Structure of the Root in Modern
Russian George Shevelov 106

PART TWO

- Are They Kul'turny? Albert Parry 125

PART THREE

- Russian Majors in American
Colleges Catherine Wolkonsky 136

REVIEWS

- L. Sadnik and R. Aitzetmüller, Handwörterbuch zu den alt-
kirchenslavischen Texten Felix J. Oinas 144
- Anthology of Old Russian Literature, ed. Ad. Stender-
Petersen Serge A. Zenkovsky 145
- Horace G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic
Grammar W. C. Jaskiewicz 146
- B. O. Unbegaun, Russian Versification Richard Burgi 147
- The Selected Letters of Anton Chekhov, ed. Lillian
Hellman Frances de Graaff 148
- Eugene Pyziur, The Doctrine of Anarchism of Michael
A. Bakunin Nicholas V. Riasanovsky 149
- George Heard Hamilton, The Art and Architecture
of Russia Fan Parker 150
- Joseph Reményi, Three Hungarian Poets, Bálint Balassa,
Miklós Zrínyi, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz A. C. Varga 151
- Eduard Beneš, Memoirs of Eduard Beneš Václav Beneš 152
- Nicholas Voinov, The Waif Leon I. Twarog 153
- Jozef Lettrich, History of Modern
Slovakia Serge L. Levitsky 154

<u>Attack from the Sea</u> , MOSFILM, 1953.....	Claude P. Lemieux	155
NEWS AND NOTES.....		156
Transliteration.....		160

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Editor

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich University of Washington	J. B. Rudnyčkyj University of Manitoba
Zbigniew Folejewski University of Wisconsin	Anthony Salys University of Pennsylvania
William E. Harkins Columbia University	Thomas A. Sebeok Indiana University
The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S.J. Fordham University	Gleb Struve University of California
Claude P. Lemieux U. S. Naval Academy	Nicholas Vakar Wheaton College
Horace Lunt Harvard University	René Wellek Yale University
Oleg A. Maslenikov University of California	

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Note: The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.

Articles submitted should follow strictly the directions for typing and style as contained in the MLA Style Sheet and should use the transliteration system employed by this Journal. Unaccepted manuscripts accompanied by postage will be returned.

PART ONE

A NOTE ON INTERNAL SOVIET PROPAGANDA

By Alfred Senn

University of Pennsylvania

The present sketch is concerned with internal Soviet propaganda in Lithuania, a country with a non-Russian population, annexed by the Soviet Union by force and now a so-called "constituent republic" of the Soviet Union.

The statements of this report are based on printed material published during the last few years, especially on two Lithuanian books published by the Soviet authorities in Vilnius, Soviet Lithuania, during 1954, namely, A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore (Lietuvių tautosakos rinktinė [Sbornik litovskogo fol'klora] prepared by Amb. Jonynys, A. Mockus, B. Uginčius, M. Vymertė, under the editorship of K. Korsakas) and A Dictionary of the Present-Day Lithuanian Language (Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas; editorial committee: Prof. J. Balčikonis, Prof. K. Korsakas, Prof. B. A. Larinas, J. Kabelka, J. Kruopas, A. Lyberis, K. Ulvydas).

A study of the Dictionary is revealing, inasmuch as it presents the Soviet doctrine in all its ramifications. It is a one-language dictionary with the definitions of the listed words (about 45,000) given in Lithuanian. The history of this dictionary is interesting. It shows that a first version was rejected by the Communist Party, because it was not sufficiently based on Soviet authors. The point is that every entry had to contain some Soviet idea or reference to the Soviet order, if at all possible. This is easy to achieve in the case of words like religion or God, where the Communist definition had to be given exclusively. Thus, under the entry religija 'religion' (pages 666-667), we find the famous quotation from Karl Marx, "Religion is the opium of the masses," in addition to a similar quotation from Lenin's writings ("Religion is a type of spiritual oppression") and a lengthy

diatribe against religion in general. Similarly, under the entry rišti 'to bind' (page 679), we find the phrase "to join the workers' movement," while under the entry spalis 'October' (page 751) there is a rather long sentence: "The Great October Revolution of the Communists ushered in a new era in the history of mankind." Fortunately, these extra, space-consuming, adornments had to be limited in view of the limited over-all space available. Our evaluation of the Dictionary is "excellent," except for this ideological flaw. This excellence is primarily the result of the superior competence of Prof. J. Balčikonis, mentioned as the first member of the editorial committee.

Our estimate of A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore is much lower than that of the Dictionary.

The main objectives of internal Soviet propaganda in non-Russian areas are the following: (1) Soviet-Communist indoctrination, (2) establishment of the Soviet economic order, (3) establishment of the Soviet-Communist ideology (including atheism), (4) supremacy of the Russian people with complete Russianization of the non-Russians as the ultimate goal, (5) vilification of the non-Communist countries, especially the U.S.A.

The general objective of Soviet-Communist indoctrination is unmistakably stated on page 7 of A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore: "It is to be hoped that this selection will in some way help to throw light on Lithuanian folklore and to promote a better understanding of it from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint and that it will be a useful auxiliary tool in utilizing the riches of Lithuanian folk poetry for the needs of Soviet society." Compare with this the statement on page 5: "In selecting the folklore material for this publication, the ideological content of the selected items and their artistic value were taken into consideration." Of the two criteria of selection mentioned here, only the first one was applied in all cases. All the most vicious attacks on the "bourgeois" world and especially the two poems directed against the United States are without artistic value.

In Soviet publications, the terms socialist, socialistic (in contrast to Social Democrat) are used in the sense of "Communist, Communistic, Bolshevik." Thus, the Bolshevik "October Revolution" of 1917 is called "the Great Socialist October Revolution." The way of life now imposed on the people of the Soviet Union is called "the Socialist Order."

These terms occur in A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore (page 6), and are specifically defined in A Dictionary of the Present-Day Lithuanian Language (page 749).

All scholarly work in Soviet Lithuanian is under the strict control of the Communist Party. Directives are prepared in Moscow and then sent to the local agencies. Thus, the above-mentioned revision of the Lithuanian Dictionary was necessitated by the interference of the Communist Party upon receipt of the directives allegedly prepared by Stalin himself. On page 6 of A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore we find the statement that the material is presented "in accordance with the general practice observed in Soviet folklore studies." Again, on page 7, we read: "This Selection of Lithuanian Folklore is the first attempt to provide our reading public with the most characteristic examples of Lithuanian folk poetry in the arrangement prescribed by the Soviet science of folklore." This means that a single Soviet pattern is imposed on all scholars throughout the entire Soviet Union with all its subdivisions.

It is a general practice in the Soviet Union to exalt Soviet publications at the expense of earlier non-Soviet work done in the same field. Even when exactly the same methods are used, there will be a statement in the Preface that this is the absolutely best method ever used, that the Soviets (that is to say, Moscow) invented that method, and that any earlier publication is inferior. We find the following statement on page v of B. Sereiskis' Short Lithuanian-Russian Dictionary (Kaunas, 1948): "The earlier dictionaries are already obsolete both as to content and the method of presentation. Therefore, the publishers have done their best to give to the Soviet reader a dictionary of the new type, satisfying as far as possible the modern needs." On this subject, the editor of A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore has the following to say (page 5): "The Lithuanian folklore collections published in the times of the Tsar and of the bourgeois regime present a false picture of Lithuanian folklore, because for various reasons the most progressive products of Lithuanian folklore were often excluded from them." It should be added here that "progressive," in Soviet parlance, is synonymous with "communistic."

A real cult of Stalin developed all over the Soviet Union. Margaret Mead refers to it in her Soviet Attitudes Toward Authority (The Rand Corporation, 1951), page 65, stating,

in metaphorical terms, that "Stalin holds the sun in one hand and the moon in the other and is credited with a long list of fructifying deeds." We can actually speak of a Soviet "mythology" in which the sun symbolizes Stalin. This shows up in various passages of A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore, e. g., in the following two poems:

1. (page 465) Bright daylight broke,
Stalin's sun;
There is none fairer
In all the world.
2. (page 475) They would enslave
The whole wide world,
If Stalin's sun
Didn't shine o'er us.

"Stalin's sun" actually means Stalin personally. While these poems were made to order in Stalin's lifetime (apparently during the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1940-1941), the Stalin worship continued even after his death, that is, until the spring of 1956.

In this connection it is interesting to notice how old Lithuanian love songs have been exploited for Soviet Russian propaganda. On page 60, we find the following song.

The sun rose in the eastern sky,
While clouds were coming from the west.

I saw my girl walking along,
Most beautiful, like the rising sun.

My dear, my sweet, come here to me!
Let's speak together loving words!

A dozen years I've cared for you.
A golden ring I've promised you.

This popular song has long been widely known among the Lithuanians and was included in collections published long before the beginning of the Soviet regime. In the annotations of A Selection (page 506) it is claimed that it symbolizes the love of the Lithuanian people for the "great" Russian nation in recognition of the help rendered in "liberating" the Lithuanians and establishing the Soviet order. The first stanza is specifically utilized for Stalin worship. Actually, the first stanza is a typical introduction to a love song. It is simply

a nature picture, as is to be found as early as medieval French and German poetry, as well as in the poetry of other nations. The same introduction, with almost identical words, appears in another Lithuanian love song (page 72), but this song is not politically exploited. It runs like this:

Tell me, sweet maiden, tell me, my dear,
Where did the sun rise.

The sun rose in the eastern sky,
While clouds were coming from the west.

While clouds were coming from the west,
Along the garden came the youth.

Earlier Lithuanian folk tales and anecdotes are full of jibes at other nationalities or representatives of neighboring countries, e.g., the Gypsies, Jews, Germans, Poles, White Russians, Russians, and Letts (or Latvians). This is a universal phenomenon and quite natural, just as it is a natural phenomenon for the Swiss to use occasionally derogatory or contemptuous designations for the Germans (that is the inhabitants of Germany) and the Italians (the inhabitants of Italy), or for the Germans to designate the Swiss by uncomplimentary names.

The present collection of "Lithuanian" folklore is purged of scornful remarks about such other nationalities that are included either in the Soviet Union (Gypsies, Jews, Letts, Russians, White Russians) or in the Soviet Orbit (Poles). This is in line with a Soviet directive valid for the entire Soviet Union, namely, that there must be no quarrel among the members (i.e., nationalities) of that Union. This is one of the points hinted at in a statement (page 7) about "the arrangement prescribed by the Soviet science of folklore" and about "the needs of Soviet society." While no mention at all is made of Gypsies, Letts, White Russians, and Poles, the Russians are presented as the saviors of the country and of the Lithuanian nation, of course, always as the bearers of the Soviet order, of the new gospel, with Stalin as their great prophet, symbolized by the sun that rises in the east. Whereas in the past the Jew was the symbol of moral corruption (especially in his function as saloon-keeper and moneylender), not the slightest shadow is permitted to fall on his character in this book. The negative characteristics which were previously ascribed to the Jew are now attached to the "bourgeois"

in general, especially the former nobleman, the independent farmer (that is, the peasant who has not joined a collective farm or the well-to-do peasant before collectivization), and the (Roman Catholic) priest. In one story a Jew is even depicted as morally superior to a priest. Actually, this is a left-handed compliment, since it implies that such moral conduct is not expected of him.

Only the German is excluded from such favorable treatment, in spite of the fact that East Germany lies in the Soviet Orbit, as Poland does. Clearly, the German is considered as an enemy of the Soviet Union, and the East Germans are at best on probation.

Of the countries and nations not bordering on Lithuania, only the United States (called "America") and the Americans are mentioned, and always very unfavorably.

The inculcation of an anti-American attitude is apparently an important element of internal Soviet propaganda. This becomes clear when in a chapter entitled "Proverbs and Popular Sayings" (pages 459-500) we find the following spurious insertions:

He really stretched himself out: his feet are in Lithuania, but his head in America. (Meaning: He cannot be trusted.)

He threatens like Truman with the atomic bomb. (Meaning: Don't mind him!)

He behaves ruthlessly like an American in Korea. (Meaning: You need not be afraid of him; we can master him.)

This is Korea for you—many an American lost his teeth there. (The American is held up to ridicule: this is considered a very effective propaganda weapon.)

A frontal attack on the United States is made on page 174 where the following poem is printed:

America is acclaimed
As a land of opportunity.
But when we see those opportunities,
Our tears flow down in streams.

I'm sending home this letter
That all Lithuanians know
How we in America live —
That everybody be told.

Just as in spring the waters flow
And form one immense flood,
So the wretched who went there
Suffer misery and death.

Even shepherd boys
Will leave their flocks
And travel to that land
To see distress.

Once you are there,
You'll have no end of woe:
With the people of that land
You won't be able to converse.

You won't hear the cuckoo bird
Calling in its homey note.
You'll only hear the lowly poor
Complain of misery and despair.

Arriving there you see
That land of "opportunity."
You'd like to go back home,
But that's out; you can't.

On page 514, the following annotation to this text is given:

This is a song dealing with the hard life and working conditions of the Lithuanian emigrants in America. According to the singer (from whom the text was written down), this song was sung by Lithuanian workers living in America and sent in letters to relatives and friends in Lithuania as a warning not to emigrate to that country of misery, injustice, and extreme exploitation. The song is known in several variants. The text was written down in the neighborhood of Kupiškis in 1930.

A variant is given on page 175:

I, a Lithuanian boy,
Will write a letter.
I'll describe for all
Conditions in America.

America is acclaimed
 As a land of opportunity.
 But when one sees these opportunities,
 Our tears flow down in streams.

Wherever you go, wherever you look,
 The weary folks complain.
 Some walk around for weeks
 Without a job.

The annotation on page 514 states that this text was written down in 1948 from a woman 60 years of age, at the village of Bieniūnai, Rimšė township, Zarasai county.

In the alphabetically arranged list of the songs presented in the book (this index covers pages 543-547), the first of these two poems is the very first item; so that the attention of the reader consulting the index will be always drawn to it. The songs are alphabetized according to the first letter of the first stanza. The first word of the first stanza of this poem, as printed on page 174, is Amerika. The second item of the alphabetical index begins with the word Anksti. However, the composition of our anti-American poem makes it clear that the stanza which in this book is given as the second stanza (beginning with Leidžiu) was Number 1 in the original. This is confirmed by the order of the stanzas in the variant printed on page 175 (see above). Thus, the order of the two stanzas was changed in order to enable the editor to place this poem at the head of the index.

The over-all impression is that the Soviet-Lithuanian scholars are in constant fear of Moscow. They are afraid of not being considered good Communists and sincere friends of the Russians. An indication of this can be seen in the following points:

1. There are numerous falsifications in the texts of A Selection of Lithuanian Folklore. Since there was a dearth of pro-Russian and pro-Communist material in the Lithuanian language, translations from the Russian were made ad hoc.

2. A feverish effort is made to present the Lithuanians as appreciative friends of the Russians. This is another falsification. Earlier Lithuanian literature and folklore was saturated with hostility toward the Russians. In the books under discussion, however, even the contemptuous designation

maskōlis 'Muscovite' is completely absent. The word is even omitted in the Dictionary, as if no such word existed.

FORM AND THEMATIC UNITY IN KAREL ČAPEK'S TRILOGY

By William E. Harkins

Columbia University

There is little doubt that Karel Čapek's trilogy of novels, Hordubal (1933), Meteor (Povětroň, 1934), and An Ordinary Life (Obyčejný život, 1934),¹ represents his crowning achievement, perhaps that of modern Czech literature. As René Wellek has observed, the trilogy is "one of the most successful attempts at a philosophical novel in any language."² Yet outside Czechoslovakia the three novels are less well known than Čapek's more sensational dramas, and have aroused little critical attention.³ This in spite of the fact that the three novels of the trilogy represent serious attempts to develop new forms for the modern novel. In them Čapek comes to grips with the philosophical problem of truth and reality, as well as the esthetic problem of the representation of reality in the novel.

One's first impression is that the theme of the three novels, as for so much of Čapek's work, is merely that of the relativity and plurality of truth. For Čapek there is no single truth; there are a multiplicity of truths depending on the personality of the observer and the viewpoint from which he observes. This is Čapek's relativism, which brings him close to Pirandello among modern writers. But in fact relativism is only the starting-point of the three novels, and in the end they surmount the anarchy of a purely relativistic point of view.

The first novel, Hordubal, is based on actual events which took place in Slovakia; Čapek has transferred the locale to the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine. His hero, a simple peasant named Juraj Hordubal, has worked in the American coal mines for eight years. He returns home to his wife, Polana, and his child, Hafie, to find that the affections of both have been estranged by a new hired hand, Štěpaň Manyá. Hordubal is apparently blind to the change, and though Polana

refuses to sleep with him, he continues to believe in her fidelity and goodness. Yet he cannot ignore the truth entirely, and is forced to keep Štěpán on against his own wishes, even betroth his child to him in order to silence the village gossip. Somehow in his dumb devotion he reconciles his faith in Polana's fidelity with the realities of the situation. In the end he is murdered by the two lovers, who drive a large needle through his heart. But is he really murdered? The post-mortem reveals that he was already dying with fever when the lovers killed him. Is the motive for murder money or resentment? Which of the guilty pair drives in the needle? Is it in fact a needle, as the local doctor testifies, or a bullet of small caliber, as the city specialist asserts? The police investigation and the trial can only convict the guilty lovers, but they cannot establish the whole truth, and Hordubal's blind devotion is quite beyond their ken; his actions appear totally irrational when viewed in retrospect. With a start the reader learns that the wife whom Hordubal adored as beautiful is "old and skinny" as the doctor sees her. And in the end the heart of Juraj Hordubal, sent off to a clinic for examination, "was lost somewhere, and was never buried," for Hordubal's love can never be comprehended.

In the second novel, Meteor, a mysterious traveler crashes in a plane during a violent storm. Unconscious, he lies in the hospital, dying. Five persons try to guess his identity and his story: two physicians, a nun who nurses him, and two patients: a clairvoyant and a writer. There are a small number of known "facts": the stranger has contracted yellow fever before his departure, and hence the country from which he comes can only be one of several tropic regions. The mixture of coins of various nationalities in his pocket suggests that he is from a part of the world where there are colonies, most likely the West Indies. Apparently he was in a great hurry, for he chartered a private plane during a storm. He was returning home, perhaps, not going away, for men who return to something they have left travel faster than those who set out for a new world. On such deductions as these the stranger's "objective" biography rests. Against this background the nun, the clairvoyant, and the writer imagine his whole life and the circumstances which have led to his rash and hasty journey. The nun dreams that he is returning to a youthful sweetheart, whose simple, honest love he could not accept while a callow youth, and which he learned to value

only after he had lived and suffered. The clairvoyant imagines that he is a brilliant chemist whose youthful discoveries seemed too fantastic at the time to be credible. Discouraged, he throws up chemistry, but returns to claim the success rightly his when subsequent research by others justifies his theories. Finally, the writer supposes that the stranger is a victim of amnesia who cannot marry the Cuban girl he loves because he lacks an identity; he returns to claim a name and fortune when despair at last shocks him into remembering who he is. The three tales differ, though each of them may possess some share of truth. But at the end the stranger dies without speaking; a news despatch reveals only that he came from Cuba.

The conflict in Hordubal is that of internal and external points of view; in Meteor it is between different external views. In An Ordinary Life the final possibility is exploited: a conflict of different internal points of view, of a relativistic pluralism in the individual's conception of himself. A retired railway official undertakes to write the story of his life. It is an ordinary story, or so it appears at first, but the official wishes to set it down just because it seems so ordinary, and because he feels a compulsion to set his affairs in order before death. But the further he goes with his analysis the more complex his "ordinary" life becomes. The "ordinary" man is only one aspect of himself, he discovers; in quick succession a whole series of other personalities unfold within him, some fully developed, others merely potential: an ambitious and ruthless person, a hypochondriac, a poet and dreamer, a hero who worked for the Czech underground during World War I, a resigned beggar, a perverted sensualist. All of these personalities live within him, a whole host of potential lives. And he reflects that it is this very pluralism of personalities within him which enables him to comprehend the manifold nature of human life; he is the microcosm which duplicates the macrocosm of human society.

On the philosophical plane, Čapek's trilogy is an attempt to deal with the problem of truth; on the artistic plane, it represents an effort to break through the form of the conventional novel and its representation of reality. The conventional, "realistic" novel assumes that reality is single and objective, while the novel of introspective experience suggests, at least in its method, that reality is merely relative and subjective. Čapek avoids both these extremes, for he is seeking

to reconcile subjectivity and objectivity, relativism and absolutism, pluralism and monism. Thus he creates a new form of novel, neither objective nor introspective, which can reconcile these dialectical antitheses in man's perception of reality.

The three novels of the trilogy represent three separate attempts to create such a novel. In Hordubal this is achieved by destroying unity of point of view, in the conventional novel customarily one and the same. The first part of Čapek's story is told, for the most part, as Hordubal's own inner monologue, while the last two parts (which are in effect but one), describing the police investigation and the trial, are conventional, externalized narratives which depict Hordubal's death as seen by the village in which he lives, by the police and the court. At the same time there is a sudden change of tone, a drop from the poetry of Hordubal's inner monologue to the pathos of everyday observation. Critics have objected to this interruption in the narrative unity, but in fact it is justified. Emotionally the change in point of view follows necessarily from the death of Hordubal, to which it gives immense pathos as well as irony; there can no longer be an inner monologue, for there is no longer a hero to pronounce it. Hordubal's love no longer exists, and cannot be reincarnated at the trial, where his motives are only vulgarized and misunderstood. Philosophically, of course, this transition from inner monologue to external narrative reflects the opposition of subjective and objective points of view which is the novel's theme.

In Meteor Čapek departs even further from the technique of the conventional realistic novel. There is only a dying man, a wrecked plane, and a mystery: why and where did this stranger rush in such a storm? Behind these slight indications lies a reality of unknown aspect and dimensions. Čapek has almost entirely destroyed the "realistic" side of the novel: the objective world is reduced to an absolute minimum: all is fantasy and imagination. But the author destroys to create anew: reality returns as something deeper, not as a chain of trivial details in the life of a stranger, but as the essence of human life as such, which the stranger possesses in common with the three narrators. They can tell his story because they share his nature as a human being. All three are in a sense aware of this identity of theirs with the dying man. The nun feels it only dimly: for some reason she must dream

of him. "At times it was as if the man was actually telling me something, and then again it was as if I had seen myself what was taking place," she says. The clairvoyant is more fully aware that he can intuit the dying man's story just because the two of them share the same essential nature as human beings. He justifies his intuitions in this way:

When we imagine a river, a whole river, not as a crooked line on the map, but as a whole, with all the water which has ever passed between its banks, your image will embrace the spring and the flowing river and the sea, all the seas in the world, the clouds, the snow and vapor, the breath of the dead and the rainbow in the sky, all that, the whole revolution of all the waters in the world will be that river.

We can know the mysterious stranger's fate, he means to say, for we know man. But we know man, in turn, because we know ourselves. We share the human essence; we ourselves have the potentiality of all human action. "Whatever we look at is a thing-in-itself and at the same time something of us, something of ours and personal; our knowledge of the world and man is something like our own confession," Čapek comments in the Epilogue to the trilogy. "I am that man," the writer in the hospital says of the stranger who has become his fictitious hero.

Hence the Ordinary Man must be written to complete the trilogy. To know others—to know man in the abstract—we must know ourselves. And in this final part of the work conventional narrative form is again shattered. To be sure, novels have often been cast in the form of diaries or confessions. But in Čapek's novel this choice of form is not external or incidental; it is not simply a method of motivating the narrative as written work, of pretending to justify its existence. Here the form is directly linked to the philosophical theme. A man records his own life, not from vanity, but out of a desire to record an "ordinary" life, which appears to him, paradoxically, as insignificant and yet, somehow, as singularly important. In a sense it is not his own life, even, which he is recording, but "ordinary life" as a universal.

And, in turn, the form of the personal confession is violated by Čapek for the sake of philosophical insight into man's reality. The confession ends abruptly, as the hero discovers that he is not merely an "ordinary man," but a

host of personages, some far from ordinary, some even fantastic or purely evil. The smooth narrative form breaks down, and a hectic dialogue begins, as each of the personalities in turn interrogates the others, each asserting his right, too, to be counted and to exist. This dialogue of interrogation and counter-interrogation is clothed in a rough, clipped style which is the very antithesis of the peaceful narrative of the "ordinary man." Thus rational reminiscence is destroyed, giving way to a breathless, irrational dialogue of almost primitive artistic immediacy. And finally the multiplicity of personalities within one man is identified with the plurality of society: the world of personages within us is the same as the world without. "Have you ever seen anyone, brother, who couldn't be your brother?" one of the inner group asks the "ordinary man." "This is just the reason why we can know and understand plurality, because we ourselves are such a plurality," the author adds in the Epilogue.

The three-part division of a trilogy suggests a dialectic path to truth, and in a philosophical novel we might justly expect it. But the three novels do not represent the simple working out of the formula of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Rather it is within each novel that we find the dialectical triad exemplified.

In Hordubal the three parts of the novel are in fact two, as has already been suggested: the police and the court are both external observers who see Hordubal's life from their own restricted, even arbitrary, point of view. And this novel in fact gives us only the two-part formula of thesis—antithesis. The thesis is Hordubal's love; the antithesis, the failure of the world to understand his love. The novel ends without reconciliation; at the conclusion we read that "the heart of Juraj Hordubal was lost somewhere, and was never buried." The synthesis can come only with the meaning of the trilogy as a whole: each love is essentially unknowable, but all human love is of the same essence.

In Meteor the three narratives of the nun, the clairvoyant, and the writer apparently do not yield to the dialectical formula. In fact, as Čapek himself has pointed out in the Epilogue, there are not three narratives, but four. Besides these three reconstructions, there are the deductions of the two physicians made from the medical evidence. This, rather, constitutes our thesis: the "objective truth" about the unknown man. The three narratives, in turn, constitute an

antithesis: they present an "intuitive" comprehension of the man's life. Their essential likeness to one another is suggested by the fact that Čapek is able to differentiate them only with difficulty. The nun's tale and the clairvoyant's are similar in their assumptions: the nun's tale is taken from a dream, while the clairvoyant bases his narrative on telepathic perception. The narrative of the poet is distinct, it is true, and is itself a kind of synthesis of objective and intuitive approaches, for the writer relies on deduction (though he is far less cautious in his deductions than the physicians) as well as on personal intuition and pure fantasy. But his tale resembles that of the clairvoyant in its essential subjectivity; it is as much a reflection of himself as of external reality. Subjective intention thus plays the role of antithesis in the novel. The synthesis of objective and subjective roads to truth is found in the fact that both of them agree at the end (the news despatch that the stranger in fact came from Cuba). Such a synthesis, however, may seem forced. A better one, perhaps, can be found within the writer's tale itself. Here the stranger has no identity; in this state he lacks definite personality: he can be anything, assume any character or profession, however ridiculous or vile. But in the end he discovers his identity and returns to claim it, to become himself; in other words, he does have an essential self, and his life is no mere illusion. Man is infinite potential, Čapek seems to be saying, but a potential which is at the same time constantly becoming actualized and defined.

In An Ordinary Life we find a multiplicity of personalities, and the triad formula is again not obvious. But we can construct an ethical triad (or a psychological one) with little violence to the novel: the "ordinary man" is good as he appears to himself; his life is contented and productive. But underneath lurks a self which is slothful, discontented, brutal, and perversely evil. Or, he appears to himself as a rational, conscious creature, but beneath the surface there lies an unconscious, entirely irrational self which is even more alive in its animal-like vitality. The synthesis then appears in the discovery that personality is manifold. Good and evil, conscious and unconscious become mere aspects of reality, ways of viewing the complex which is a living being.

Still another dialectical formula runs through the trilogy as a whole. It takes the form of the antithesis of absolutism

and relativism, of monism and pluralism. In Hordubal the police and the court cannot comprehend Hordubal's love. But this is not the same as saying that no one can, for the reader can: Hordubal's love can be communicated through the miracle of artistic expression which Čapek has achieved. Perhaps Čapek is not even conscious of this contradiction in the meaning of his work, but it hardly matters, for the contradiction contributes brilliantly to the significance of the trilogy as a whole.

In Meteor, too, we see that the truth of a man's life can be known, not as a series of individual, isolated facts (which would have a very limited usefulness for knowledge, in any event), but rather as the individual life partakes of the essence of human existence.

Finally, in An Ordinary Life, the synthesis achieved in Meteor somewhat abstractly (for the stranger's life was only imagined) is reached vividly and intimately, as a man writes the story of his own life. The very fact that the individual is a plurality of personalities allows him to share in the nature of all human life. True, as one critic has observed, Čapek's biological speculations are beside the point: if each man were actually the sum total of the personalities of all his ancestors, then each generation would be twice as complex as the preceding one, which is nonsense.⁴ But Čapek's thesis may be true metaphysically without being susceptible of formulation in precise biological terms.

Only time can tell whether Čapek's experiments with the form of the novel have been successful. Perhaps he was more a destroyer of old forms than a true innovator. But whatever their esthetic suitability, the appropriateness of the forms which he created for his philosophical ideas can hardly be denied. On the philosophic plane there is little doubt that he is successful; in spite of the diversity of the three novels which constitute the trilogy, there is a remarkable unity in their view of reality. Here the author has finally rescued himself from the anarchy of philosophical relativism without losing the sense of freedom and the richness of experience which the relativist, pluralist viewpoint can give.

Perhaps Čapek's greatest achievement, however, in the trilogy is that of the humanist and democrat: his three heroes, moving and sincere portrayals, exemplify the measure of his faith in the nobility of the common man. The blind, inarticulate peasant with his pathetic love; the unknown man who finds

his true self only to perish; the "ordinary man," great in nothing but his humanity—they are among the author's finest creations.

Notes

1. The trilogy was translated by Mrs. M. Wetherall and published by Allen and Unwin in London, 1934-36.

2. R. Wellek, "Karel Čapek," Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature, ed. Horatio Smith (New York, 1947), p. 139.

3. An exception to this statement is the article by D. D. di Sarra, "Materiali per uno studio sulla tecnica del romanzo novecentesco: Povětroň di K. Čapek," Ricerche slavistiche, I (1952), 38-66. Di Sarra's chief purpose is a comparison of Meteor with such contemporary novels as Gide's The Counterfeiters and Huxley's Point Counter Point. In all three novels, writers appear, permitting the author to reflect on the literary process itself.

4. A. van Santé, Over Karel Čapek (Amsterdam, 1949), pp. 65-66.

TOWARD AN ANALYSIS OF BORIS PASTERNAK

By Helen Muchnic

Smith College

Pasternak inscribed his autobiography, Safe Conduct, "To the Memory of R. M. Rilke," and then explained this dedication: "I do not present my reminiscences to the memory of Rilke. On the contrary, I myself received them as a present from him." From Pasternak's point of view this is not a gracious compliment but a statement of fact, and, as one soon realizes, it is, in addition, just one instance among many of what he considers to be his relation to all people, not only to the artist who had first roused the poetic sense in him, indeed, not only to people but to events in history and to objects in nature.

The essence of this view reminds one of Rimbaud's "Je est un autre. . . . C'est faux de dire: Je pense. On devrait dire: On me pense." It is the position of philosophical idealism, in which a basic interrelationship between being and being, subject and object, is accepted as the postulate by means of which reality may be comprehended. Translated into terms of art, it becomes the kind of symbolism that uses images to express universal concepts rather than private experiences. Pasternak's work belongs, it seems to me, to this category of metaphysical poetry, and Safe Conduct both explains and illustrates the assumptions on which it proceeds.

Majakovskij had begun his autobiography: "I am a poet. That is what makes me interesting." And he had then listed those events in his life that had had a bearing on his work. But Pasternak says that he is not writing his autobiography at all, that he thinks "only heroes deserve a real biography," and his story about himself turns out to be not a portrait of himself as either man or artist, but an ars poetica, a spiritual history of all poets, not of one particular poet. Its three parts represent the three main stages of the poet's progress: the arrival at the

threshold of poetry, the discovery of poetry, and the portrait of the poet, who is not Pasternak but Majakovskij. And the title, with its suggestion of coming to terms with estrangement, is clarified in the course of the narrative: the poet's understanding of art—which is also an understanding of himself—is the passport he carries with him on his journey through an alien world, the token of his citizenship and the protection he requires.

That this story of a journey in self-discovery should culminate in the portrait of another is entirely logical. For in the sense that Rilke had presented Pasternak with memories of himself, Majakovskij presented him with his philosophy of art. Both men were symbols of a reality that all three shared, the reality of the poetic experience; and in Pasternak's development Rilke stood for its inception, Majakovskij for its final formulation. Through a process, that is, that began with Rilke and ended in Majakovskij—and in the course of which others, Skrjabin, the elder sister V., Hermann Cohen, had had their share—Pasternak came to an awareness of the meaning of art. Each of the intervening non-poetic relationships was passionate and each was broken off in a way that involved pain, but each was also a step in a growing insight into the nature of poetry. It was a progress that imposed a form on all of Pasternak's stories, which are shaped, as Mr. Schimanski has noted, by "one single *leitmotif* . . . the problem of consciously replacing something that has been lost so as to restore the equilibrium that has been upset."¹ There is, I think, something more to it than this. It is true that in each of the stories "something is lost," but it is also true that what is found is always augmented in value by the very loss; the loss is never absolute: it has its meaning, the search proceeds through error, and arrives at a truth larger than that originally conceived. So in *Safe Conduct* the process is from "faith to faith" in a progressively deepening consciousness of relations: between the individual and his world, between brute fact and subjective experience, between the passing moment and the historic process, between possibility and necessity, a journey that brings the poet, at the end, to a knowledge of the place art holds in life.

Were he writing "an aesthetic of creativity," says

Pasternak, he would base it on two concepts, the concept of power and the concept of the symbol. By "power" he means "feeling," but he assigns to both feeling and symbol very different roles from those they had been given by the Romantics and the Symbolists. Feeling for Pasternak is the theme of art, not its method, and his world is not the stuff of dreams but a world of cognitions and perceptions. In the last analysis, reality is unknowable; it is emotionally apprehended and deflected by emotions. But art approaches a knowledge of it. "Focussed on a reality which feeling has displaced, [it] is a record of this displacement." And the method of art is to take from nature whatever objects will serve it to express its theme. Any object will do. "Any one is precious. Any one chosen at random serves as evidence of the state which envelops the whole of transposed reality." Art, that is, is not a tool of discovery, but a mode of perception, and its special province is the province of power. Its function is to give a name to what would otherwise be nameless. The themes of other perceptions have their names: number, meaning, idea. Power alone has none; it receives it from art, which speaks of it in symbols, for "the direct speech of feeling is allegorical and cannot be replaced by anything."

In the light of this theory, Pasternak's own work can be explained as the allegorical speech of direct feeling, a language composed of the interchangeable images of a transposed reality, through which power alone is expressed. Thus, for example, Venice becomes for him a symbol of continuity and of the unity of culture; he sees in it how the present confers eternity upon the past; and this suggests a further symbol, which leads up to the dramatic image of the last section, the image of Majakovskij. One has the impression, indeed, that it was for the sake of this last image that the whole book was written. "I turn [to autobiography]," Pasternak had said, "when a stranger's so demands it." In this case, it had certainly been demanded by Majakovskij's, so suddenly and so shockingly terminated. Venice embodied what Pasternak had already seen as the essence of history: a contrast between two necessities, the necessity of life to will and freedom, and the predetermined necessity of death. The living moment was a "leap away" from this predetermined necessity to possibility; and just

as appearances had meaning only with reference to a transcendent principle of reality, so the living moment could be understood only in the context of its inevitable extinction. Life itself was a symbol, a gesture in defiance of death.

So, finally, Majakovskij—the incarnation of poetry, driven by his genius as a poem is driven by its theme; himself the subject of his work, just as power is the subject of art; the concealed direction of his inward self symbolized in acts and gestures, which he had chosen as a shield and worn for protection, much as the images of a poem symbolize its theme—Majakovskij, at the end, having thrown away the last shreds of pose, was reborn into a new adolescence, that period of life when mountains are made of mole-hills and poetry begins. In death "he was indignant, and he pouted." This is the final symbol: the poet as the ultimate rebel, whose life, having defied for a while the necessity of death, then turns on possibility, and "with that pedantry with which the will sometimes follows the direction of a realized necessity," gives, as it were, assistance to its own fate.

But although Pasternak presents Majakovskij as the embodiment of poetry, he is careful to point out that there is that in life which no system will explain. The genius stands apart. "His being reposes in the experience of real biography and not in symbolism refracted with images"—which is, I think, another bit in evidence of Pasternak's independence and accuracy. His outlook is strongly tinged by the Neo-Kantianism of the Marburg school. There are in Safe Conduct unmistakable echoes of Hermann Cohen, with whom he studied, and whom he greatly admired. But he dropped his study of philosophy at the moment he had achieved a coveted triumph, in the way he had previously abandoned music. He saw that his interest in philosophy was literary rather than philosophic, and although his work retains the exactitude of statement that had delighted him in Cohen's teaching, it is not influenced by his philosophy in the same sense as Pope's, for example, had been influenced by Bolingbroke's. (His remark about genius certainly sounds existentialist rather than Neo-Kantian.) Similarly, his way of writing was initially a conscious departure from Romanticism which, he said, suited neither his temperament nor his craft: he could not think of "life as the life

of a poet," and he "feared any kind of poetising which would place [him] in a false and incongruous position." His work, then, is the severely precise utterance of a poet who knows the meaning of perfect pitch in music, of the perfect line in drawing, of the perfect argument in metaphysical speculation, but who recognizes that however splendid the constructs of sound, line, idea, word, they must stand for him as symbols only of a reality that is always beyond them and always evanescent.

Note

1. Stefan Schimanski, The Collected Prose Works of Boris Pasternak (London: Lindsay Drummond, n.d.), p. 40.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ROOT IN MODERN RUSSIAN

By George Y. Shevelov

Columbia University

Trubetzkoy, who has given an as yet unsurpassed synchronical survey of Russian morphophonemics, was rather irresolute in his characterization of Russian word roots. He wrote: "In root morphemes the number of syllables is as a matter of fact unlimited. In practice, root morphemes of more than three syllables occur only in foreign words, and an unusually large number of syllables in such root morphemes is felt as an earmark of their foreign origin. But trisyllabic root morphemes are not rare in 'genuine' Russian words." He quotes as examples perepel, kolokol, karandaš, karapuz, gornostaj, skovorodka, balagan. After pointing out some specific types of roots: monoconsonantal in pronouns (k-to, č-ego, t-o, /j-ivó/) and in šč-i; those ending in a vowel (V) in verbs (zna-t', zre-t'), he gives up further characterization: "Possible structural types of root morphemes are so numerous and various that we must abstain from illustrating them with examples."¹

Trubetzkoy did not corroborate his view with any statistical data. To check up his observations I have taken as test material the first 500 words (excluding prepositions, conjunctions, and particles) from Bunin's Mitina ljubov'.² The results of the count follow:

Structure	Examples	Number of words
CVC	<u>zim-a</u> , <u>lic-o</u> , <š#l' -i>	260
CCVC	<u>sneg</u> , <u>kryš-a</u> , <u>drem-at'</u>	52
CCCVC	<u>straš-no</u> , <u>strel-a</u>	3
CVCC	<u>vesn-a</u> , <u>verx</u> , <u>revn-ovat'</u>	37
CCVCC	<u>prost-o</u>	3
CCCVCC	<u>strat-noj</u>	1

Since consonantal clusters both before and after the vowel in all the above cases are clusters which are regularly admitted in Modern Russian and which function as simple consonants (C) do, we can in further exposition denote by C not only a consonant but also any admitted consonantal cluster, and thus reduce the above 6 types of roots to one, monosyllabic roots with a V between consonants, CVC. Their total number is 356 (73%). Monosyllabic roots ending in C but with no initial C follow next:

VC		32
VCC	<u>utr-o</u> , <u>art-ist</u> , <u>obšč-ij</u>	4
VCCC	<u>ostr-yj</u>	1

The small number (37 — 7%) may be reduced even more because the bulk of the first number consists of specific pronominal roots on- (12x) and ët- (15x), and the remainder is formed by už-e, which, rather, is probably unanalyzable and is best considered as a particle. With these cases excluded, the total would be only 5 cases, i.e., 1%, a negligible quantity.

Roots ending in V are represented by two categories, altogether 40 cases:

CV	<u>pod-nja-všijsja</u>	38
CCV	<u>pere-sta-n'</u> , <u>po-spe-vala</u>	2

The main body of the first figure is formed by the often recurrent verbal root by- (14x); 6 cases are represented by the pronoun ja, and 13 by the pronominal root i-/e- (ix, im; ego, emu), both latter cases dubious and better excluded from the count. If we exclude them, the total would be 21, or 4%.

Roots devoid of V occurred only in pronouns: 35x C (to, tý, my, vy, čto), 6x CC (svoj, tvoj, gde; also the numeral dv-enadcatyj), the total being 41 cases.

The next type of roots is disyllabic roots with same vowel in both syllables: CVCVC (xoroš-en'kaja, terem, golos, porog; teper', govor-ila, podob-nye, Egor, devjat-yj).³ These roots amount to 16 cases.

What remains is roots unanalyzable in terms of preceding root types, thus seemingly confirming the statement of Trubetzkoy that roots in Modern Russian are indefinitely

variable in their structure: bul'var, žavoron-ki, trotuar, monast-yr', vizantij-skije, pamjat-nik, kitaj-skuju, impe-ratr-icu, bogem-u, teatr-al'nyx, užin-at', pro-deklam-irovala, maner-noe, Cimmerman. This supplies us with 16 cases. The condensed summary table may be the follow-ing:

CVC	356
VC	37 (thereof 27 pronominal)
CV	40 (thereof 19 pronominal)
C	41 (all pronominal)
CVCVC	15
Unanalyzable	16
Total	505 ⁴

There are no reasons to suppose that a count in other texts would essentially change the picture of root types distribution, at least as long as a traditional, purely static approach is applied as above. The question to answer, however, is whether all the types of roots found merely coexist in Modern Russian, or whether there is an expansion of certain types and a contraction of others. It is a question of productiveness or unproductiveness in different root types; of some types spreading at the expense of other types; of those other types shrinking or losing ground. Trubetzkoy's approach in this respect was traditional and lacked dynamics. The Russian language, insofar as roots were analyzed by him, was for him a pile of dead objects; for us at present it rather is a bundle of variously directed forces. This is not to reproach Trubetzkoy: in the twenties and the thirties the most important problem was to delimit synchrony from diachrony and to establish synchronical analysis as a legitimate part of linguistics. Nowadays, the main problem a scholar faces is to grasp synchrony as dynamics. This has become possible on the basis of the achievements of Trubetzkoy and his generation.

And yet, one must admit that in the problem of Russian roots Trubetzkoy was an inconsistent synchronist. He paid tribute, unexpectedly and perhaps unconsciously, to the adversary he bitterly fought. There is a great deal of the etymological, i.e., historical, approach in the way he treats Russian roots. To take one of his examples: historical linguists may argue about the etymology of gornostaj 'ermine.'⁵

But from the synchronical viewpoint, the word is a compound with two roots, gor- and staj, each of them monosyllabic (CVC). No Russian speaker would be able to explain why this animal, which is not found in mountains (gora!) nor lives in packs (staja!), has such a name. Still, for Modern Russian no reason exists to take the entire word for a mere trisyllabic root, as Trubetzkoy did.

It appears that in such cases Trubetzkoy followed the traditional approach to roots, i.e., of considering them as bearers of referential meanings in words. This is true in the sense that, inasmuch as a word has referential meaning, this meaning is centered in the word root. Practically, however, the search for referential meaning turns out to be a search for motivation, for what Humboldt and Potebnja called the inner form of words. Parovoz, it says, is called so because it voz-it par-om. To see how illogical such an approach is, it suffices to compare the word with paroxod and ask whether the words for railway engine and steam boat could not easily be interchanged. As in many other cases, logic is commissioned here to patch or disguise what actually is not subject to general logic, since it follows another set of rules, the rules of a particular system of a language in a given time of its existence.

Hence it is crucial to establish that roots are primarily morphemes which are to be delimited by delimiting other morphemes, with which the roots are correlative (affixes, endings). The roots may have referential meanings, but they need not have them. Let us test this by an analysis of some compounds in Modern Russian. From the point of view of referential meaning of their components, they may be classified in four groups:

1. Both components have clear-cut referential meanings: šfiro-manija, foto-bakterija, psixo-analiz.
2. Only the first component has such a meaning: disko-bol, ikono-stas, meteoro-lit. The second component is identifiable as far as it (1) does not belong to the first stem, and (2) cannot be identified as a suffix, both provided that the stress pattern of the word is that of compounds, with the only or the main stress on the second component.
3. Only the second component has a referential meaning: uni-forma, gelio-centrizm, pato-genez. The first component is identifiable as far as it (1) does not belong to the

second stem, and (2) cannot be identified with a prefix, both provided that the stress pattern of the word is that of compounds.

4. Here we come to the compounds in which neither root has referential meaning from the viewpoint of Modern Russian: ippo-drom, sapro-fag, ksilo-fon. Words of this type belong in Modern Russian to compounds primarily because they follow the structural pattern of Russian compounds (in accentual contour, number of syllables, distribution of vowels, unidentifiability of any part of the words with affixes, etc.). This possibility is enhanced if the distribution of the would-be roots is such that they both or at least one of them reoccur in other words, as:

	<u>ippo-drom</u>	
<u>ipo-teka</u>		<u>aèro-drom</u>
<u>ipo-xondrik</u>		<u>palin-drom</u>
		<u>velo-drom</u>
	<u>sapro-fag</u>	
<u>sapro-fit</u>		<u>antropo-fag</u>
		<u>fito-fag</u> , etc.

The inference of our cursory glance at the four types of Russian compounds is that structural characteristics of the words suffice to label these words as compounds or not and to single out their roots; whereas characterization from the standpoint of referential meaning is in many cases insufficient. In other words, the analysis of referential meanings can be dispensed with for purposes of morphology. The entire analysis may be based on structural characteristics alone.

This statement, as well as the analysis of compounds performed above, will probably not be opposed by educated speakers of Russian (although they may frown indignantly at the identification of /ipa-/ in ippodrom and ipoteka, etymologically, of course, quite different.)⁶ Still, in identifying words as compounds they themselves may be guided by those scraps of acquaintance with foreign languages they customarily possess. They will have a harder time following the principle of structural analysis consistently applied also to those cases in which its results would differ from those of an etymological approach. The case of gornostaj quoted above from and against Trubetzkoy is a still easier one: here both components at least have their "extra-etymological," "synchronical" "meanings." In karapuz,

another example of Trubetzkoy's, a "meaning" can be discovered at best for the "second component" -puz. Finally, an assertion that skovorodka and balagan, too, fit into the structural pattern of compounds might seem quite shocking: /skav-a-rót-k-a/, /bal-a-gán/. With this approach, one horrifying from the point of view of etymological thinking but sound and sober synchronically, either word has two monosyllabic roots. This statement may be reversed, if one prefers to calm down "etymologists": the tendency of Modern Russian to have predominantly monosyllabic roots results in historically arbitrary breaking down of longer and otherwise unidentifiable morphemes into "arbitrary" roots.

Quite a few words with etymologically polysyllabic roots in the Modern Russian vocabulary actually function as compounds. I have excerpted material for this article exhaustively from several pages of Avanesov and Ožegov's dictionary.⁷ Some, more noticeable, examples follow, hyphenated after their linking vowels (it would be impossible to quote all of them): kande-ljabr; kani-fas, kani-fol', kanni-bal; kanti-lena; kara-bin, kara-van, kara-vella, kara-gač, karakatica, kara-mel'; karda-mon, kardi-nal; karia-tida; katavasija, kata-komby, kata-lažka, kata-log, kata-rak-ta, kata-strofa, kata-falk, kate-gorija; kacə-vejka; kaša-lot (cf. kaše-var'!); kolo-šmatit'; ko'če-dan; kombi-nezon; koče-vrjažit'sja, koče-ryž-ka; koše-nil'; krino-lin; kurolesit'; labo-ratorija; laza-ret; lapi-da-rnyj; lati-fundija; lejko-cit; leo-pard; mago-metanin; mada-polam; mani-kjur, mani-fest; mara-fonskij; meri-dian, meri-nos; metro-nom; mecco-tin-to; mina-ret, mine-ral, minne-zinger; mira-bel', etc. In some of these words our breakdown coincides with the etymological one; in most it does not. In either case it is based on synchrony and disregards etymology.

The same principle applies to the delimitation of roots and suffixes. It is well known that in Modern Russian some words are marked out by suffixes, although etymologically they are loan-words and in their original languages did not have any suffixes or at least not these suffixes. It suffices to refer to such words of Turkic origin as armjak, arganak, also (if Turkic, too) kabluk, etc. On the other hand, no one can deny a tendency to single out "suffixes" in recurrent post-root parts of numerous loan-words recently borrowed. Vinogradov speaks in such instances of "little-tangible"

(maloosjazatel'nye) suffixes, e.g., -z, -zis (analiz, genezis), of suffixes "with various objective meanings" like -ing (bljuminig, miting, etc.).⁸ His observations, vague and "little tangible" as they are, do grasp some of the reality of Modern Russian. That they contradict the traditional methodology seeking for "meanings" in both roots and suffixes is of no importance. In these phenomena the same tendency of Modern Russian to have roots according to its own pattern, i.e., predominantly monosyllabic, manifests itself. If one dares to divide bljuminig into the root bljum- and the suffix -ing, both devoid of any clear-cut referential meaning, one must be bold enough to tackle in the same way morphological analysis of such words as, e.g. kuš-ak, baš-k-a, kuvš-in, loš-ad', kurg-an, end-ov-a, etc. The corresponding selected material from Avanesov and Ožegov is: kar'-er-a, mad-er-a, man-er-a; kat-et, kast-et, kvart-et, kok-et-k-a, kol-et, kors-et (cf. kors-až), lanc-et, laf-et, levr-et-k-a, ljun-et; mak-et, manž-et-a, mušk-et; kort-ež; kastr-at, kvadr-at, karb-on-at (cf. karb-ol-ov-yj), leg-at, magn-at, mand-at, mul-at, musk-at; kat-er, kvak-er, kel'n-er, kol-er, krat-er, krejs-er, krejc-er, kap-er, karc-er, makl-er, mist-er; kart-of-el' (cf. kart-oš-k-a; cf. koš-el'), kart-el', karus-el', kaf-el', kóm-el', krend-el', makr-el', muf-el'; kaps-ul-a, kastrj-ulj-a; komm-un-a, lag-un-a, ljad-un-k-a, etc.

It is more difficult to speak about purely "structural" prefixes. Prefixes in Modern Russian are much more limited in number than suffixes are, and more often (though not always, by far) have spatial connotations, i.e., a type of referential meaning. Nevertheless, it is possible to observe that in a sense "meaningless," "structural" prefixes seem to be penetrating Modern Russian more and more. The most typical series is that of kom-, kon-, and ko-. The following morphological breakings down are possible: kom-bin-ir-ova-t', kom-pens-ir-ov-at', kom-plekc-ij-a, kom-plim-ent; kon-dens-ator, kon-dic-ionn-yj, kon-dukt-or; ko-sek-ans, ko-sin-us, ko-tang-ens, ko-èffic-ient, also ko-mmut-acij-a, and, further, ka-čuč-a, ko-lenk-or, ko-libri, ko-llédž, ko-llektiv. Some "native" Russian words may be considered in the same way: ka-pust-a, ko-leb-a-t', ko-len-o, ko-les-o, ko-lup-a-t', ko-lym-ag-a.⁹ If this is acceptable a next step may be taken, and the words of the type kajuta, kotil'on, kosmetika may be divided into ka-jut-a, ko-til'-on, ko-smet-ik-a. Do they function so? Can this principle be applied to

such cases as ža-voron-ok? go-sud-ar'? I prefer to leave this an open question until a more detailed analysis has been performed.

So far we have dealt with monosyllabic roots. The introductory material excerpted from Bunin also contains disyllabic roots of the type CVCVC with the same vowel in both syllables. Historically speaking, they go back to pleophony (golov-a, korov-a) or to loan-words from Turkic languages with their vowel harmony (bazar, turusy). In the first category the middle consonant was r or l, in the second, any one. The originally pleophonic roots of the type golov-a bridged the gap between the monosyllabic and disyllabic roots in that that they followed the same stress pattern (golová, acc. gólovu like nogá, acc. nógu). On the other hand, through originally pleophonic words with stable stress (type koróva), ties were established with numerous loan-words with immovable stress. Another bridge was created here by alternations of the type zamorózit' ~ zamoráživat', nakolótít ~ nakoláčivat' (/aro- ~ ara-/ , /alo- ~ ala-/) which spread pleophony beyond o and e groups, to which it originally had been restricted. Thus, roots of the type CVCVC, which we can label as structurally pleophonic, have entered the pattern of Modern Russian morphology, although statistically they are far behind the monosyllabic roots.

In assimilating structurally unfamiliar roots Modern Russian uses structural pleophony broadly. The following words are or may be analyzable so: kanat, kanon, karas', karat, katar, kokon, kokos, kolob, kolonn-a, koloss, komar, kotor-yj, kočan, krečēt, ladan, lebed-a, lebed', lemex, mažar-a, major, makak-a, malag-a, mammon-a, mamont, maral, mesjac /m'ě-s'ic/, metis /m'it'is/, murug-ij, nabat, navag-a, vesel-yj, etc.

Both structural pleophony and suffixation are employed in karan-daš, karan-tin, karač-k-i, karač-un, kator-g-a, keren-k-a, koka(j)-in, kokar-d-a, kokot-k-a, kollo(j)-id, kollokv-ium, kolon-ij-a, koman-d-a, kotom-k-a, kočer-g-a, lavan-d-a, lakom-i-t', lebez-i-t', legen-d-a, lelej-a-t', lepest-ok, magaz-in, majol-ik-a, majon-ez, malax-it, mamal-yg-a, manat-k-i, marak-ova-t', mecen-at, meščer-jak, etc.

It is still to be clarified whether the roots with consonantal clusters between the two identical vowels may be considered as pleophonic in the above sense, such as kandal-y,

kanton, karman, kaskad, kaftan, ketmen', koldob-in-a, komnat-a, mandol-in-a, mansar-d-a, margan-ec, mušmul-a, na-bekren'. Such structures seem rather to tend to be broken down into monosyllabic roots and "suffixes."

Singling out familiar roots by means of "arbitrary" compounding, suffixation, "pleophonizing," and, probably, prefixation are typical procedures of Modern Russian morphology. By applying them, the language in most cases succeeds in making its words really Russian. Only a negligible quantity of words defies this internal reshaping. In many cases such words do not become a part of the active vocabulary. They mostly remain erudite and/or designate remote and foreign notions.

If now, with this experience, we return to the words from Bunin which have previously escaped our morphological analysis, we shall be able to reduce essentially the "insoluble residue." The words bul'var, trotuar, Kitaj, bogema, manera, užinat' yield the "synchronical suffixes" -ar, -uar, -aj, -em, -er, -in. The root in monas-tyr' proves to be "synchronically pleophonic," and so probably does the root in pamjatnik /pám'tit-n'ik/.¹⁰ If we admit consonantal clusters in this type of roots between the two vowels, we can add the word imper-atr-ic-a. The word žavoronok would be analyzable by dint of "synchronical prefixation." The residue, then, is reduced to four words: vizantijskij, teatral'nyj, prodeklamirovat', Cimmerman, less than 1% of all words, two of them, in addition, foreign proper names.¹¹

While tending to reshape words with unfamiliar morphological structure according to usual patterns, Modern Russian in certain cases retreats before the overwhelming number of the new-type words and, albeit grudgingly, admits new samples. The most characteristic example is compounds without linking vowels, with two roots connected loosely or by a parasitic consonant between them which, then, begins functioning as a linking consonant. Examples of the first type may be kapel'-diner, kapel'-majster, kvartir-majster, kvint-ěssenciija, kegel'-ban, kolon-titul, kolon-cifra, kol'd-krem, kran-balka, krem-soda, land-šturm, lejb-gvardija, lejt-motiv, lend-lord, ljumpen-proletariat, mizan-scena, mjuzik-xoll; of the second type, rarer: land-s-knext, metra-n-paž, metr-d-otel', štab-s-kapitan.

This foreign sample has been supported by native abbreviated words in which the first component ends in a

consonant (kolxoz, lekpom, mestkom) and by rare Russian native compounds without linking vowel which go back to ap-positions or petrified expressions (meč-ryba, mir-volit'). At present, compounds without linking vowel in Russian are numerous enough and characterized sufficiently to become, in their turn, the basis for synchronical decompositions. The following words may serve as examples of the latter: karam-bol', kar-bjurator, kar-niz, kar-teč', kver-šlag, kok-sagyz, kok-tejl', kol'-rabi, krax-mal, krep-dešin, land-šaft, lev-koj, man-til'ja, man-tissa, mund-štuk, etc.

The would-be compounds with stress on the potential linking vowel are not so well established. Historically they were represented by three words, kikí-mora, kará-mora, kará-kulja, exceptional because of their affectivity, according to Trubetzkoy.¹² In our days the type has increased: cf. kará-kul', metá-fora and, in particular, numerous words in -graf, -log, -metr, -èdr, -liz which shifted their stress from the last syllable during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (geó-graf, kriminó-log, laktó-metr, tetrá-èdr, katá-liz). Whether it means that -graf, etc., are being transformed into suffixes,¹³ or that virtually that type of compounds spreads, remains unclear. So far, it is more prudent not to consider this type as actively participating in decompositions which characterize words in Modern Russian, although it could offer a solution for several otherwise unanalyzable cases (kaníkuly, muxórtvyj, namédni).

With all other procedures of decomposition applied, the unanalyzable residue in the material excerpted from Avanesov and Ožegov is insignificant. In relation to the total number of words excerpted (about 4000) it makes less than 0.5%.¹⁴ Mostly these are disyllabic words with different vowels in the two syllables: karel, kolumb-arij, kómpas, kómpleks (kom- hardly functions here as a prefix because it is accented), kostjurn, lament-acija, laring-it, latun', letarg-ija, ljumin-iscentnyj, lazur', madrig-al, maksim-al'nyj, makul-atura, maněvr, merkant-il'nyj, mikrob, musul'm-anin. Other words contradict the Russian pattern because they admit two vowels not separated by a consonant: kauz-al'nyj, kaup-er, kaust-ik, kauč-uk, kreat-ura, kreol, laur-eat, luiz-it, made-muaz-el'. A few words are close to compounds but cannot enter the type because /u/, and not /a/, is used in the place of a linking vowel: manu-skript, manu-fakt-ura.

If we set aside this negligible amount it may be said that all non-pronominal roots in Modern Russian have the structure CVC, VC, CV, or CVCVC, C denoting a consonant or an admitted consonantal cluster, and V, a vowel, the same if repeated.

The objection of non-uniqueness of the suggested solutions may be raised. Indeed, in certain cases the same word can be analyzed in two, or even more, various ways. Thus, e.g., partly returning to the examples already used, balagan may be analyzed as a compound bal-a-gan, or as a pleophonic stem + a suffix: balag-an; kanonada as a compound kan-o-nad-a or as a pleophonic root + a suffix: kanon-ad-a; accordingly, kar-o-tel' or karot-el': min-a-ret or minar-et; and with possible prefixation: kompr-o-miss or kom-pro-miss, etc. One may say that after eliminating the criteria of referential meaning the structural distribution alone has necessarily led to ambiguity. So the conservatives in art say that the elimination of "normal objects" from abstract painting opened it to daubers and confused all former value criteria.

It is not my purpose here to defend abstract art, if it should need a defense. As to the non-uniqueness of morphological analysis suggested here, this is, in my opinion, rather a theoretical advantage, while for practical purposes non-uniqueness can be easily avoided. To begin with the second: the only thing required in order to have unique and unambiguous results of morphological analysis is to agree on the hierarchy of approaches employed. If a gradation is set in which, say, compounding has preference, and suffixation, alone or with pleophony, is given second place, there will be no doubt that, say, balagan is to be treated as a compound. The hierarchy may be more elaborated with many "if's." In any case this is a matter of practical efficiency, and is feasible. It may be recalled, incidentally, that with the traditional semi-etymological and semi-structural approach, instances of ambiguity or of impossibility of decision were frequent, too. It was not easy to say without hesitations whether the root in komnata is komn- or komnat-, whether or not komar contains a suffix -ar, where is the root in kočevrjažit'sja, etc. Thus, neither approach yields unambiguous and ultimate decisions for all cases. The difference between the two does not lie in this.

It lies in the fact that, with the traditional semi-etymological approach, solutions were non-unique and arbitrary. With the purely structural approach, as suggested here, they are also non-unique but no longer arbitrary, in the sense that their vacillations reflect vacillations of the Russian language itself. It is not the linguist who does not know which of the two possible decompositions of, say, kanonada is preferable, but the Russian language. If synchrony is an incessant, permanent conflict of variously directed forces emerging from the system itself, this conflict is the reality of the language. Only that method is adequate which is able to grasp this conflict. In our case, Modern Russian struggles towards a specific structure of root through the flood of the extremely heterogeneous (in this respect) linguistic material. Often it only gropes toward the solution. There is nothing surprising in the fact that frequently several solutions are grasped at simultaneously because no one satisfies completely and because, in this case, to use the expression with a grain of salt, the ends justify the means.

Many phenomena of Modern Russian corroborate our observations. Let us take a glance of two of them: children's language and stress shifts.

When a Russian child decomposes the words ètažerka and taburetkà into èta žerka and ta buretkà,¹⁵ it is not only because the initial syllables of the two words sound like the demonstrative pronouns ètot and tot. No native speaker would decompose, say, the gen. sg. ètaža into èta ža or toska into ta ska, for the simple reason that ža and ska would contradict the rules regulating the structure of Russian word root; whereas the separation of èta and ta from ètažerka and taburetkà makes the new "roots" of the two words exactly fit into the familiar pattern CVC (žer-k-a, bur-et-k-a).

Many other "word mutilations" recorded from Russian children also reveal a keen feeling for root structure. In vazelin, kompress, ventiljator, èkskavator the extensions of the roots are obscure: vaz- or vazel-, kompress, or komp- or -press, etc.? When Russian children rearrange these words in mazelin, mokres, vertiljator, peskovator (Čuk. 22, 23, 25) this is not only to introduce comprehensible root morphemes ("motivation") but also to attain a root morpheme with normal structure and clear boundary of the type CVC (maz-elin) or CVCC (mokr-es, vert-iljator, peskovator). This is a kind of folk etymology. But the gist of

any folk etymology, against the widespread opposing view, is primarily to adjust roots or "roots" to familiar samples and, only as a matter of secondary importance, to interpret words semantically. This is why—a generally known fact—so many folk etymologies are devoid of any logical connection with the main notion designated by the word. Profoss became proxvost in Russian not because police inspectors had tails (xvost!) but because the morphological set of profoss is unclear, whereas it becomes ideally lucid in proxvost. Many puns deliberately created by writers in principle are a sort of folk etymology, as well. They, too, reveal fine feeling for morphemes, in particular for root structure. When Leonov makes one of his characters sarcastically change ortodoksy into vertodoksy,¹⁶ it means that presence of the two roots ort- and -doks was "felt" in the original word, though they have no referential meaning within Russian. In Il'f and Petrov's pun transforming Savonarola into Savanorylo (Kak sozdavalsja Robinzon) a word which was amorphous in Russian morphology is given its morphological form by introducing "roots" of familiar structure CVCVC (savan-) and CVC (ryl-). The comic effect is produced by the conflict between the now so transparent morphological set-up and the striking nonsense in the combination of the referential meanings.

Substitutions in children's language, folk etymology, and puns are, however, on the margins of linguistic development and functioning. They prove that "feeling" for root structure does exist in Modern Russian, but they do not essentially affect the development of Russian. This effect is tangible in the sphere of stress, especially of stress in foreign words. In Russian linguistics, the stress in loan-words is usually accounted for by the source of borrowing. Such is, for instance, the most recent attempt in this domain, made by Bulaxovskij.¹⁷ But no one has as yet succeeded in explaining Russian stress in loan-words from this viewpoint alone, and Bulaxovskij, too, has failed. This is not an individual failure but a failure inherent in a fallacious method. Once adapted by Russian, foreign words start adjusting to the Russian set of morphemes, and their actual accentuation is a compromise between the original one and that being imposed by the morphological patterns of Russian. Bulaxovskij in his article time and again notes discrepancies between the stress of a word in its original language and in

Russian. Sometimes he even gives explanations for stress shifts from the Russian morphological system, e.g., evnúx becoming évnux under the influence of kónjux, káučuk changed to kaučúk as affected by Russian words in -úk, tíun replaced by tiún according to Russian words in -ún, proffl' having become prófil' because it was originally feminine and, thus, found itself in the type própast', prórub', etc. But actually these shifts of stress are not only induced from one word or a group of words, but depend chiefly on decomposition of foreign words into morphemes shaped according to the requirements of Russian morphology. The shift of the stress in evnux, kaučuk, tiun signals that new, Russian, roots have arisen in these words: evn-, kauč-, ti-, Russian in the sense that they follow the structuring patterns of Russian morphology.

In many more cases Bulaxovskij admits that he is unable to explain shifts of stress. Some of these cases are perfectly clear from the point of view suggested in this article. Let us analyze briefly a part of these instances. Turkic loan-words should have final stress, but the words bakaléja, baklága, vatága, kibítka deviate. Finnish loan-words are bound to have initial stress, but the words saláka, pel'mén' deviate. The words krakovják, temlják, pasternák, župán, rydván, maljár, stoljár do not follow the penultimate stress of their original language, Polish. The Greek words avtomát, avtoxtón, aksióma, giácint, gipotenúza, gippopotám, kaštán, kráter, mavzoléj, medúza are expected with different stresses: avtómát, avtóxton, aksíoma, giácint, gipoténuza, gippopótam, káštán, kratér, mavzólej, méduza. The English words bjudžet, komfort, reporter acquired an inappropriate final stress (Bul. 8-15). All these "deviations" make no difficulties if explained from the system of Russian. They follow the familiar pattern of stress in suffixed words or compounds: bakaléja like assambléja, galéréja, axinéja; baklága, vatága like dvornjága, sotnjága; ¹⁸ kibítka like nalfv-ka, žestjánka, masljánka (Ak. 247); sal-ák-a like kusáka, rubáka; pel'm-én' as pletén', kistén'; krak-ovj-ák, temlj-ák, pastern-ák like kostják, kruglják, porožnják (Ak. 237); žup-án, rydv-án, kašt-án like stakán, buján, velikán; cf. also karmán, kal'ján, etc.; giac-ínt like incidént, koëfficiént, diktánt (Vinogradov, 110); gipoten-úz-a, med-úz-a supported indirectly by the type skul'ptúra, korrektúra, literatúra (Ak. 206), in its turn supported by a series of the native

suffixes of the type /ul'-a/, -uš-a (čistjúlja, činúša) with the same stress pattern; krát-er like káter, kréjser, máklér: cf. séver, věčer, šáber; bjudžét like kisét, berét, lafét; report-ěr, brettěr, bašněr, kioskěr, uxažěr (Ak. 226);¹⁹ avt-o-mát, avt-o-xtón, gipp-o-potám, mavz-o-lěj, aks-i-óma have joined the pattern of compounds; com-fórt singled out the prefix and, consequently, the stress was to be shifted to the newly found root.

Other cases are more delicate and require a subtler individual treatment. The shift of stress in súffiks, préfiks (Bul. 14) from the final syllable probably means that -iks in both words obtained the status of a suffix, so that from the point of view of Modern Russian—horribile dictu—the roots are now /suf-/ and /pr'ef-/. Originally the opposition between the two words was expressed by their prefixes pre- and suf-. Since for Russian it was not spatial these morphemes were not motivated as prefixes and would become parts of roots. These roots, however, did not fit the Russian morphological pattern. By assigning the common final part of the words -iks to be a suffix (cf. also kodeks, indeks) the new acceptable roots have been obtained. The stress shift only sealed the morphological reconstruction of the two words.

Bulaxovskij (14) is amazed by the final stress in fistulá, which is neither Latin nor Italian (both stress the initial syllable). There is no suffix -ul-á in Modern Russian. Apparently the word was affected by the whole category of feminines denoting spatial notions. They have the same number of syllables, the same structure of both root and "suffix," and always the final stress: glubiná, širiná, tolščiná; širotá, vysotá, dolgotá; prjamizná, krivizná, levizná.²⁰ Fistula meaning span of an "abnormal hollow passage from an abscess, cavity or hollow organ to the skin," etc., fitted well into this type of Russian words both morphologically and semantically.

While here semantics aided morphology, déspot (Bul. 12) shifted its stress from the final syllable despite its semantic aloofness from the words with the suffix -ot /-at/ (groxot, rokot, topot, xoxot); and the same category was inducing in the case of the early 19th century klímát becoming klímat (/kl'ím-at/) (Bul. 13). In the case of átóm transformed relatively recently into átom the crucial role fell to avoiding the possible decomposition of átóm into <ot-óm> with an

embarrassing pseudo-prefix ot-.

Reasons for the greater part of stress shifts in foreign words of Modern Russian lie in how the corresponding words are or tend to be broken down into morphemes in Modern Russian, and this is conditioned by the regularities in Modern Russian itself, disregarding the real history of the words and their morphological make-up in the languages of their origins. Moreover, Russian morphology is responsible not only for shifts of the stress. If the stress preserves its original place it is again, as a rule, the structure of Modern Russian which dictates it not less than the momentum of the usage in the lending language. In Bulaxovskij's material this is obvious in the cases in which Latin, which supplied Russian with the words in question, had double stress in the paradigm: pórtio—portiónis, míssio—missiónis; réferens—referéntis, insúrgens—insurgéntis (Bul. 14). In the first type Russian accepted the stress of the nominative (pórcija, míssija), in the second that of the oblique cases (referént, insurgént), because these stresses corresponded exactly to the "rules of play" in Russian.²¹

In the words postulát, degenerát, originál, intellékt, kreatúra, menzúra, kódeks, according to Bulaxovskij, 13, Russian has preserved the place of stress as it was in Latin. This seems true, but actually one must ask: Has Russian really preserved the old stress place because it so was in Latin or because it suited its own system? One may compare postulát, degenerát with soldát, bulát, špagát, kastrát, limonát (so in the early 18th century); the underlying Russian stratum may be seen in the adjectival type borodát, volosát, pernát. For originál see metáll, kapitál, kardinál, šakál. Words in -kt, -nt, -st could have found support in Russian adjectives in -ist, -ast: goríst, rečíst, kameníst, etc. For kreatúra, etc., cf. the type devčúra, etc. In the light of what has been said, the answer will be that the main forces at work here were those of Russian itself, whereas inertia of the original accentuation could at best have played a subordinate and auxiliary role. Paradoxically, one could say that the stress place in postulát is Russian in spite of the fact that it coincides with the stress place in Latin, in this word.

The material of children's language, folk etymology, and distribution of stress, even in those scarce examples which have been cited here, shows that morphemic

decomposition in Modern Russian based on the Russian pattern of roots (as well as other morphemes) is a reality, and not a fiction of theoretical linguistics. It is often not easy for the language to adapt the variegated and heterogeneous material which tends to inundate it. By hook or by crook the Russian language tries to reshape this non-accommodated matter and make it submit to the rules which characterize Modern Russian. This permanent conflict constitutes the gist of the morphological status of Modern Russian, considered synchronically. For synchrony is development, and not the eternal peace of a linguistic cemetery.

The structure of the Russian root from the viewpoint of dynamic synchrony has never been studied. In this rather informally written article many problems could only be touched, some of them only raised. Exhaustive treatment would require much more space. Preparatory studies are necessary. My purpose has been to turn attention to these questions and to show the most important aspects of the problems involved, not to give definitive solutions.

Notes

1. N. Trubetzkoy, Das morphonologische System der russischen Sprache (Prague, 1934) (TCLP 5, 2), p. 17.

2. Quoted from I. A. Bunin, Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax (5 vols., Moskva, 1956), IV, 28-30.

3. /jigór/, /d'iv'ataj/: both /o/ and /a/ in unstressed position after a palatalized or palatal consonant can be realized in Modern Russian only as /i/. It is because of this that one can speak about identity of the two vowels in either word.

4. Although the number of the words taken for count is 500, the number of roots proved to be 505 because 5 compounds, comprising 2 roots each, occurred in the texts.

5. M. Vasmer, Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1953—), I, 296.

6. Their etymological difference is irrelevant for Modern Russian, because neither has referential meaning in Modern Russian. Nor does the difference in spelling (one or double p) matter: it is only graphic.

7. R. Avanesov, S. Ožegov, Russkoe literaturnoe udarenie i proiznošenie (Moskva, 1955), pp. 161-165, 171-175, 181-185, 191-195, 201-205, 211-215, 221-225, 231-235.

8. V. Vinogradov, Russkij jazyk (Grammatičeskoe učenie o slove) (Moskva-Leningrad, 1947), pp. 110 f.

9. A parallel with the Russian argot "prefix" ku-/ko- (Cf. V. Jagić, "Die Geheimsprachen bei den Slaven," Sitzungsberichte of Vienna Academy, 133 [1896], pp. 40 ff.) suggests itself.

10. The prerequisite being that we admit that in consonants a sequence non-palatal(ized)—palatal(ized) consonant—any consonant does occur. Then, posttonic /a/ after a palatalized consonant /m'/ is materialized automatically as /i/.

11. The popular substandard pronunciation of one among these words /t'iját'-ir/ discloses that the usual tendency to decompose refractory words in a pleophonic root + a suffix is active where the artificial pronunciation cedes to a more "natural."

12. Trubetzkoy, 33. The word kolokol quoted above from Trubetzkoy is close to this type. The only difference is that the first syllable is stressed and not the middle. The remaining word from his list of allegedly trisyllabic roots, perepel, belongs to the same type unless we analyze it into a prefix pere- and, then, a monosyllabic root -pel.

13. In this case, however, one should speak of the suffixes beginning in -o-: -ógraf, -ólog, etc. (cf. -átor in dikt-átor, organiz-átor, etc.). There is no stress shift if another vowel precedes what etymologically is the second stem: kalligráf, mineralóg.

14. The percentage would be higher if it was taken in ratio to the total number of roots and not of the words. But still it would be low.

15. K. Čukovskij, Ot dvux do pjati (Moskva, 1955), p. 14. Further quoted as Čuk.

16. L. Leonov, Russkij les (Moskva, 1955), p. 421 (So-branie sočinenij v pjati tomach, Vol. IV).

17. L. Bulaxovskij, "Russkoe udarenie zaimstvovannyx slov," Russkij jazyk v škole, 1956, No. 4. Further quoted as Bul.

18. These examples are taken from Akademija Nauk SSSR, Grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1953), I, 249. Further quoted as Ak. Historically in baklaga, vataga, kibitka no stress shift took place. Their endings are new, added in Russian. Cf. Vasmer, §.vv.

19. Where there were no native Russian words with an identical suffix the accentual regularity was established for the new category partly on the basis of the most typical stress

in this category in the original language, and partly on the basis of the closest categories in Russian. These could have been substantives with analogous or similar suffixes (i.e., with the same vowel and structure), or adjectives with the same suffixes. Words quoted here as parallel are, correspondingly, either loan-words introduced into Russian as early as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, or adjectives with the same suffixes, or both.

20. Examples from Vinogradov, pp. 139 ff.

21. Cf. such Russian (originally rather Church Slavonic) words and old borrowings as brátija, katavásija, Ázija; the history of words in -nt is not so old. They were hardly influential until the late seventeenth century. The precedent was created by words of the type aksel'bánt, ac'jutánt, patént, prezidént. Cf. V. Vinogradov, Očerki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XVII-XIX vv. (Leiden, 1950), p. 51.

PART TWO

ARE THEY KUL'TURNY?

By Albert Parry

Colgate University

A Russian professor on a Northeastern campus, a writer with an international reputation, flatly denies that there is any genuine intellectual life anywhere in today's Soviet Union. A Russian émigré now residing in Chicago agrees with the professor. He disdainfully remarks:

Kul'tura, kul'tura—

A na samom dele xaltura!

—that is, they may talk about culture all they want, but in reality they have nothing but tawdry imitation, cheap tinsel, an attempt to "cash in" on long-absent values without really bringing them back.

The Soviet regime, they insist, has destroyed all the fine roots and stems of Western culture, all the cosmopolitan verities of man's spirit, which in one way or another existed in Russia from the early part of the eighteenth century to 1917—that is, from the time of Peter the Great to the coup d'état of the Bolsheviks. In the 1700's (the émigré commentators elaborate) Peter began to transform a tiny but powerful part of the Russian nation into a thin yet influential layer of Westernized, cosmopolitanized men and women. At first these were only of the upper classes. Later, increasingly, they came to be also of the middle classes, especially at the end of the nineteenth century and the start of the twentieth. But after November 1917 Lenin, and after 1924 Stalin, wiped out this valuable layer of Russian humanity, without building anything to take its place. Still, even as they were destroying it, the dictators were conscious of the resulting vacuum. That is why they and their followers so loudly, even fanatically, claimed to be the true inheritors

and cherishers of old Russian literature and other arts. That is why the word kul'tura, with all its derivatives, is such a fetish also with Xruščev and his followers.

Not only many émigrés, but also some Western observers of modern Russia, refuse to acknowledge the existence of any such kul'tura under the Soviets. Even when the new Soviet man seems to be pro-culture and pro-Western he is actually neither, they argue, for he mistakes the form of Western culture for its spirit. He admires and borrows mere surface aspects of it—its technology, its creature comforts—but not its inner meaning and higher worth. Essentially uneducated as he remains, despite his school diplomas and various modern skills, the Soviet man is smug, unfeeling, dull. He is clean-shaven, dressed-up, and even perfumed (more perfumed, in fact, than the modern Western man of the corresponding social station is), but nevertheless the Lenin-Stalin-Xruščev reign has shaped and frozen him into a veritable troglodyte.

In his superficial borrowings the Soviet man, they argue further, misses the finer artistry of Western craftsmanship. The Soviet adaptation of Western clothes for instance, lacks their original subtle, graceful lines. The over-ornamented, too-much-balconied and porticoed Soviet version of modern Western architecture is, similarly, a clumsy, ugly simulation. In art, even as the effect of Stalin's personal taste for heroic, stilted battlefield scenes and for calendar-picture-happy Five-Year Plan milkmaids gradually fades, the new Xruščev-era landscapes are still too merely photographic, and the genre of everyday Soviet painting and sculpture continues to be deficient in imagination and dash. And there is not the slightest indication or hope that this "art," this "culture," would or could change for the better.

II

Having thus stated the case as presented by the critics of the Soviet man and of his cultural prospects, I now wish to enter my dissenting opinion.

Much of their criticism as stated above is, of course, valid. Yet it seems to me that these critics suffer from their memories of the golden complex of things of the period of, say, 1912 to '17. They will not settle on any terms short of the 1912-17 complex in all of its wonderful details (and

many of its details—in literature, for example—were indeed wonderful in Russia). Hence their pessimism about new Russia's cultural present and future. But these voices proclaiming the utter cultural doom of Russia seem to me not entirely convincing. Mine is one hopeful vote. And the basis for my optimism is this:

Evidence is now being brought from Russia by travelers that the interest in Western culture is high precisely on the part of those who have worked or "pulled" their way up to the new middle and upper classes from the lower strata. Concerts and theatrical productions by visiting Western artists are crowded and even mobbed. Modern Western music is bootlegged, either in original recordings brought from abroad or, more often, as reproduced by amateur technicians on used X-ray film. Russian translations of Western writers, old and new, are sold on a kind of black market at several times their publication prices. And the main thing is that this interest in Western culture is not all mechanistic, not all the result of unthinking curiosity and soulless imitation, of a desire to keep up with the Ivanovs of the newly formed upper social swim. Side by side with such empty "fashionableness," which undoubtedly exists in Russia today as in any society at any age, there is a true appreciation of the deeper values of Western culture.

To illustrate: In June 1956, on his return to New York, Isaac Stern, the first American concert violinist to tour the Soviet Union since the Second World War, said that in all of his twenty-one concerts, played to capacity audiences in Russian cities, he was impressed by the extraordinary musical sensitivity of his listeners. It was not "only to technical virtuosity and bravura effects" that they responded. "To me, far more revealing was their reaction to a musical phrase," Stern said, "the turn and warmth of a musical phrase. I saw it happen over and over again. When I'd finish with a phrase—say in the slow movement of Mozart's G Major Concerto—members of the audience would turn and beam at one another. It was as though a burst of sunlight had passed over them. . . . At other such points five or six persons would weep openly."

Stern's surprise is paralleled by the astonishment with which at least a few old Russian critics living and writing in the West have greeted the artistry of technique and the depth of thought displayed by a few young Soviet escapees

who, coming out of Russia during and after the Second World War, at once became contributors to Russian émigré journals. How could there be such craftsmanship, such profundity, stemming out of Soviet rigidity and aridity? So ask these critics in their pleased wonder.

The answer is of course in the fact that while the old classes were destroyed by the new "order," the old classics were not. And the answer furthermore is not alone in the never-ceasing fount of influence of the nineteenth-century titans of literature, but also in the living examples of such latter-day prose writers as Konstantin Paustovskij and such poets as Anna Axmatova. The Paustovskijs have been too honest as artists to succumb to the Stalin- and Xruščev-decreed prostitution of the printed word. The Axmatovas were banned for long periods, but, even in the short terms of the official relaxation of such prohibition, their vivid, thoughtful, moving poetry swept all the lesser works of all the official-line writers before it.

The very fact of official prohibition arouses Soviet readers' curiosity and predetermines their enthusiasm. Writing in Literaturnaja Gazeta of October 1, 1955, Vladimir Mixajlov reported a conversation with a young Ural worker. The worker insisted that he wanted "all" the works of authors, such as Esenin and Puškin, and was not satisfied with the "incomplete" editions available in the Soviet Union. The young man revealed that in his notebooks he had some poems by Esenin, copied apparently from a forbidden source. He said he wanted "sharp" books, not generally on sale in today's Russia. The Soviet journalist in his article tried to belittle and even besmirch the young man's intellectual hunger by hinting that what the worker really wanted was the famous poets' pornography or near-pornography. But this indictment did not seem convincing to me.

The post-Stalin praise in Russia for the late Ivan Bunin and the 1955 publication of that great émigré writer's works in a tremendous Soviet edition of 300,000 copies (the first Soviet edition since 1928!) should be explained of course not by any sincere "thaw" on the part of Xruščev and Bulganin. As Vera Aleksandrova rightly points out in her article in the New York Novoye Russkoye Slovo of September 9, 1956, Bunin's posthumous return to his native land was wrested from the Soviet leaders and their subservient publishers by the people who had "continued to love and respect" Bunin all

through the era of Stalin, and these admirers included Soviet writers such as Paustovskij no less than "rank-and-file" Soviet readers.

III

The Soviet government wants its readers to go back to old writers, but only within bounds useful for Soviet indoctrination. Russian classics are used to reinforce Soviet nationalism—and nothing else; but they are not to be read or produced on the stage to the exclusion or diminution of Soviet propaganda works. And yet the Moscow press constantly laments that, when Soviet plays are produced, theaters do very poor business—while people flock to see old classical dramas and comedies. Smart Soviet producers therefore avoid staging Soviet plays. In 1955 Soviet leaders wrathfully realized that the Ermolova Theater in Moscow failed to produce a single Soviet play in the entire year of 1954: all its repertory was classical.

Similarly, Soviet scholars avoid modern Soviet themes, seeking in historical subjects truer values (and safety from possible charges of ideological deviation) for their research and writing. On March 24, 1956, the Literaturnaja Gazeta pilloried a "horrible example" of such "escapism," citing a list of monographs in the fields of philosophy, history, economics, and theory of the state and law, published in the Soviet provinces within a recent period. Of the thirty-three titles in the list, twenty were devoted to remote historical topics and only thirteen to Soviet-era themes.

Barely three weeks earlier, on March 6, the same Moscow newspaper attacked Soviet researchers who in their writings dare to "idealize the past." Historians and historical novelists were accused of presenting tsarist officers as kindly in their treatment of plain soldiers and seamen. Such writers were charged with "forgetting the chief thing," that is, the "class essence" of relations between those old-time officers and their subordinates. Too much indiscriminate admiration was found on the part of these writers for the pre-Revolutionary times, and the Soviet government was alarmed.

The past should be either admired or vilified (says the government in effect), solely as it fits the Soviet propaganda message of this particular day. Yet the modern Soviet reader wants none or little of "class struggle" in his reading matter, especially in his favorite reading about old times

and their values. He wants the truth, above all, and nowadays dares to say so.

Some are bold enough to protest in letters to editors against what they see as excessive official criticism of pre-Revolutionary times. Five old factory workers, members of the Communist Party for a half-century, while writing from the textile center of Ivanovo near Moscow, castigated a Soviet historian for surplus zeal in following the official line. "Granted," wrote the oldsters, "that those industrialists did exploit us mercilessly. The working day was long, and fines were plentiful. But why overdo the picture? Why didn't the author consult us? Each one of us is well along in years, yet we remember clearly just how long our working day was and just how high our fines were." (*Literaturnaja Gazeta*, November 26, 1955.)

Younger searching minds go far beyond the tsarist past, far beyond Russia, and see Western classics with a lucidity not at all pleasing to their Soviet mentors and censors. And fortunately for Russia, not all such Western literature was forbidden from Soviet libraries, bookstores, and reprint editions even in Stalin's day.

The result is that in *Trud* for August 30, 1956, we read of a simple woman worker of Noginsk near Moscow, a certain Šura Kuzina, who often brought books with her to the factory, apparently to read them en route to and from her job as well as during the luncheon hour. The author of the *Trud* article reports indignantly that Kuzina read predominantly old novels by foreign writers. She admitted that she loved old novels because "they describe beautiful, noble deeds." But when the interviewer asked a would-be leading question, whether she might not find "more up-to-date examples" in literature and life "to admire and emulate," she answered, "Frankly, no!"

Another young Soviet girl became the subject of three articles in *Komsomol'skaja Pravda* in mid-May 1956, because of her outspoken non-conformity to official Soviet views. She openly declared that she saw in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* "only the tragedy of young, pure love," rather than "the pernicious influence of feudalistic relations," and she laughed at the "outdated" views of students who disagreed with her. The girl, Lilja Polonskaja, a fourth-year student of history and philology at Sverdlovsk University in the Urals, had received the highest possible marks, but she had shown

her original views from the time when, as a freshman, she surprised her school with the "pessimism" of her paper "on the folklore of the Great Patriotic War"—that is, she apparently dared to go against the saccharine platitudes on the heroism of the Russian people during World War II. Under her influence students even began to ask such questions as "Why should art inevitably have ideology? Why should it urge one to do this or that?" And the panel discussions of the fourth-year students avoided completely the discussion of political topics, but concentrated, instead, on such topics as "On Love and Friendship," "On Happiness and Duty," "Human Beauty," and "Life's Little Things."

Nevertheless, strangely enough, Lilja Polonskaja not only remained a member of the Komsomol, but for a time she was even on its roster as a regular propagandist. But then she fell under the surveillance and "re-educating treatment" of Ljubov' Čurina, an instructor in dialectical and historical materialism, who at first "saw nothing terrible in her opinions and even praised her for her sincerity." However, Čurina denounced Polonskaja when the question of dismissing Polonskaja was brought up at the governing bureau of the local Komsomol branch. The bureau passed the resolution to expel Polonskaja from the Komsomol. And then an astounding thing happened: several "activists" protested the decision as undemocratic, and they succeeded in having a general meeting of Komsomol students to pass on the case. The meeting refused to confirm the bureau's decision. The higher local authorities then stepped in and expelled Polonskaja, but she appealed to Moscow. And such is the air of these changing times that the supreme Komsomol authority in Moscow ruled that Polonskaja should be "re-educated but not expelled."

IV

This quest for truth and beauty ranges from even more remote fields than Shakespeare to the most immediate concerns of modern living.

On the extremely distant side there is a revival of the old pre-revolutionary Russian interest in the ancient classics of Greece and Rome. It may come as a surprise to foreign observers that in the summer of 1956, with much success, an Armenian actor, Suren Kočarian, was appearing on the Soviet stage as a narrator of Homer's epics. Reports reach

us that Russian theater-goers are entranced by Kočarian's rendition of The Odyssey in its ancient Greek, followed by a Russian translation.

But Kočarian, although a powerful factor in this revival, is not its very first pioneer. In 1954 a series of public lectures on the works of Aristophanes was given by some dedicated scholars in Moscow; a two-volume collection of Russian translations of his comedies was published, and all the 25,000 copies of this edition were sold at once. Simultaneously, new translations of The Iliad and The Odyssey became bibliographical rarities immediately upon their publication—so fast were they, too, sold out. Equally swift were sales of two books on Greek mythology, one of them in its third edition.

On November 10, 1955, pointing to this "growing demand on the part of our readers," two Soviet classical philologists complained in Literaturnaja Gazeta about the near-absence of the study of Greek and Latin in Soviet universities and urged that such study be expanded and improved at once, "in the interests of science and culture, in the interests of an esthetic upbringing of our youth." On June 14, 1956, the same Moscow journal printed a letter by nine Soviet scholars of philology and art, urging a state publication of the new version of The Odyssey as used by Kočarian in his stage appearances.

The fact that such complaints, recommendations, and urgings are printed in a foremost official Soviet newspaper is significant in itself. As in the case of the final disposition of Lilja Polonskaja's "heresy," we see here at work the strong force of the new popular pressures upon the Soviet government.

To swing all the long way from ancient Homer to modern home furnishings—even more tellingly the same pressures are beginning to win out against the official deadliness in the present-day applied arts. If Soviet designers in the government's pay still persist in their heavy, unimaginative styles, their Soviet customers are increasingly insisting on seeking true beauty elsewhere—abroad. Few as yet are the voices urging their Soviet fellow men to learn graceful functionalism from the West. It is still both handier and safer to search for it closer home, ideologically as well as geographically—in the satellite lands.

At an exhibit in Moscow, Czech furniture astonished and attracted Soviet visitors, with its modern, streamlined, functional craftsmanship. B. Dunaevskij, in Literaturnaja Gaze-
ta for October 29, 1955, particularly praised the lack of expensive carving, "bronze ornaments," and "whimsical curlicues." He irritably asked why such furniture, "of such gracefulness yet of such little cost" was not to be found in Soviet stores.

Another Soviet journalist, V. Nemcov, related in Kom-
somol'skaja Pravda of January 8, 1956, how on his visit to Budapest his Hungarian friends had tried to apologize for the modern, streamlined architecture of some of the local buildings. But the Russian saw no need for embarrassment; he thought they should be proud—not ashamed. He discerned true beauty in these Western lines created or imitated by the Hungarians, with little ornamentation and with "stern plainness." He rejoiced at the absence of "polished marble," so plentiful and so ugly in the latest Soviet buildings. He also praised the interiors of these buildings, particularly the little intimate cafés in them. He objected that the Soviet cafés, with their marble, bronze, and crystal chandeliers, "do not predispose one to relaxation or friendly chats." But he found a "homey yet holiday-like coziness" in the Hungarian cafés, with their small, glass-topped tables, their eye-soothing opaque wall paper, and their modest yet pretty waxed-paper lamp shades. All this, he said, must be learned, adopted, and enjoyed by Russians as a thing of simple yet true beauty.

Quite recently, as the protest of Russians against the ugliness of Soviet-made houses, furnishings, clothes, shoes, and other artifacts had risen in both volume and sharpness, Soviet journalists, tourists, and members of various missions have begun to speak yet more frankly of the beauty they find abroad, and this last not only in Prague or Budapest, but more and more so even in Helsinki and Stockholm, in Paris and Venice, and also in London and New York.

From the satellite echo of things Western, the Soviets are increasingly turning to the Western source itself.

V

To repeat the question of some of the émigrés and Western observers: Whence this seeking, this appreciation, amid the Soviet aridity and primitivism which only yesterday seemed to be killing any such comprehension of truth and

beauty forever?

The answer is not alone in the renewed opportunity for the Soviet Russians to see the West. This opportunity in itself has been the result of other, more basic factors. The more basic answer is that the Lenin-Stalin destruction of old West-inspired culture was never complete, despite the two dictators' clear intent to wipe it out thoroughly. The Communists in Russia killed off entire classes—but individuals and influences of those classes inevitably survived. The Communists attempted to use old culture and its riches for their own low ends, but the spirit and the eternal values of that old culture would neither be bent nor stupidly spent.

As late as the 1930's, through the bleakest era of purges, there remained in Russia the so-called "inner *émigrés*," men and women of the pre-revolutionary intelligentsia who either refused, or did not manage, to flee abroad while flight was yet possible. They lived on in the Soviet Union, making a mere surface compromise between their own and the Soviet ideas of verity and of beauty. They paid lip service to the new Soviet reactionary, retrograde premises in politics and arts, but in their own tight family circles and even sometimes among their few trusted friends they kept alive their own beloved values of Western civilization.

Importantly, they managed to relay some of this precious heritage to their progeny, and in rare but unmistakable cases also to some strangers—to the new intellectuals rising from the peasant and worker masses.¹ But this last group, the new Soviet intelligentsia of lower-class origin, apparently did not need much if any teaching from the surviving old intellectuals. The old culture which Soviet propagandists tried to use for their reactionary ends, but which stubbornly resisted such usage, was itself the new intelligentsia's teacher. What Aleksandr Gercen once said of literature is true of the other arts, too: "The book is the last will and testimony of one generation to another. It is a set of instructions handed over to the new sentry by the old sentry leaving for his rest."

This, then, was the well-hidden seed-bed of what genuine green shoots of cosmopolitan or West-inspired culture we now once more see in Russia. It could be guessed at, and even discerned as a fact, already through the thick, bloody fog of Stalin's time. Today, with the Iron Curtain becoming increasingly a two-way sieve, cross-fertilization

with newer Western ideas is yet more possible and is more and more a fact. Of course, the new intelligentsia, thus eagerly looking in our direction in their effort to become kul'turny, may constitute only a very small percentage of the Soviet population. And its pro-Westernism is indeed feeble compared with the old Russian intelligentsia's intake from the West and contribution to the world's treasury of cultural values. The important point is, however, that there are such people in Russia, and that they are growing in numbers, stature, and influence.

Russia, as she eventually shakes off Xruščëvism no less than Stalinism and Leninism, will not remain troglodyte. She will yet re-enter the main stream of man's creation and appreciation of the finer nuances of life and civilization.

Note

1. For two striking, first-person accounts of this heritage and influence, see: for the 1930's, V. Markov, "Et Ego in Arcadia," Novyj Zurnal (New York), XLII (September 1955), 164-187; for the 1940's, Victor Gregorij, "Growing Up in Moscow, 1940-1948," Occidente, an International Review of Politics and Society, (Torino, Italy), XI, (1955), 44-57.

PART THREE

RUSSIAN MAJORS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES

By Catherine Wolkonsky

Vassar College

Introduction

Russian as a subject is still a foster child in the undergraduate curriculum of United States colleges. When World War II broke out, there were hardly 10 institutions offering courses in Russian, but in the fall of 1956, some 165 colleges and universities were teaching it. The total present enrollment is between 4,000 and 5,000 undergraduates studying the language, certainly not an encouraging figure. According to a recent survey made by Dr. Serge Zenkovsky of Harvard University, however, on the basis of questionnaires answered by 80 colleges and universities, the enrollment shows a sharp upward trend for 1955-56 and 1956-57.

During the war and immediately after it, college administrations were rather diffident about introducing courses in Russian, for they were not sure that these courses would remain in the curriculum. Now they realize that it is impossible in our modern shrunken world to ignore a language spoken by approximately 200,000,000 people of various nationalities in the Soviet Union and widely used as a language of international communications by others. The growth of Russian as a foreign language in American universities has also been delayed by the reluctance of university students to take Russian, for fear of unpleasant suspicions or even accusations. Partly as a result of this, Russian has developed chiefly in private colleges and universities, and only to a lesser extent in state-supported institutions.

In comparison with our French, German, and Spanish colleagues, we teachers of Russian are working under several handicaps:

- (1) Our students cannot travel easily and freely in Russia.
- (2) Our enrollment fluctuates with the political situation.
- (3) There is a dearth of adequate textbooks, so that instructors are obliged to mimeograph many pages of materials, such as vocabulary, excerpts of texts, exercises, etc. For instance, I have compiled vocabularies for Evgenij Onegin, The Bronze Horseman, and some of Puškin's lyrics, for the benefit of my third-year students.
- (4) Russian is not taught in secondary schools as a rule (in only 9, according to the recent findings of Mr. Wilmarth Mott III of Colgate University). Freshmen often are afraid to start Russian because of its reputed difficulty, and prefer to play it safe by continuing a language they have studied in high school. Admission committees often encourage new students to go on with the language(s) offered for the college board examinations, instead of advising them to broaden their horizon by taking a new language. As a result, our elementary classes tend to be preponderantly composed of sophomores (at least two-thirds or three-fourths of the class). Beginning students, in my observation, know nothing at all about the language and are surprised to discover that it belongs to the family of Indo-European languages.

Concentration Programs

Concentration programs are offered by only a small proportion of the institutions teaching Russian, and they are apparently developing very slowly. Since Russian studies are really still in their infancy in this country, it is understandable that the requirements for majors are extremely varied and in the experimental stage. Now is the time to study and discuss them.

This study covers the requirement for Russian majors in 32 United States colleges and universities¹ on the basis of their bulletins and in some cases from statements obtained from Russian or Slavic departments. Some of these institutions are colleges offering courses primarily for undergraduates; in the larger universities with graduate programs in Russian, undergraduate majors can avail themselves of opportunities for graduate courses. It is natural that the type of major offered will range widely in accordance with the facilities and purpose of the institution; at Syracuse University, for example, a student may concentrate

in Russian studies without any study of the language at all, while at Harvard an undergraduate honors student must take 48 semester hours of courses in Russian.

Prerequisites for the Russian Major

In order to begin a major, the student is required in most colleges to complete two years of Russian, from 12 to 16 semester hours. Brooklyn College also requires a semester of literature in Russian, with 5 semesters of the language as a prerequisite. Cornell is the only institution which requires 6 semester hours in general linguistics as a prerequisite.

Language Course Requirements for a Russian Major

Of the 32 institutions studied, 13 demand 30 credit hours or more in the language, including the honors programs. Above the intermediate level, there is no single definite pattern for the courses in Russian required of majors. Reading in the nineteenth-century classics is usually obligatory, and often represents the core course of the program. The student is obliged usually to take from 6 to 10 credit hours of such courses, with the Universities of Stanford, California, and Michigan, and Brooklyn College, demanding the highest number of credits. Brooklyn is the most demanding, requiring semester courses in Russian in Puškin, Tolstoj, Dostoevskij, the novel, and the drama. Majors can take these courses only in Russian, although the same courses are given in English for non-majors. In some courses, the reading is done in Russian: those majoring in Russian may be required to read the works in the original, while the lectures are given in English.

Specialized Courses

Puškin: The writers whose works form the subject matter of entire courses for undergraduate majors are ordinarily Puškin, Tolstoj, and Dostoevskij. It would be unfortunate to read Puškin in translation, and a Russian major should be acquainted with his main works. Semester courses in Russian devoted entirely to Puškin are obligatory for majors at Brooklyn College, Harvard College, and Washington University in Seattle. Bryn Mawr also gives a course in Puškin, but it is optional for majors. Any course covering the Russian classics in general devotes a great amount of time to

Puškin, but the necessity of dealing with the chief works of the nineteenth century at all adequately does not permit sufficient time for a satisfactory study of his works. Presumably courses on poetry such as that given at the University of California also devote a considerable amount of time to Puškin.

At Vassar, for example, Puškin is studied in the third-year central course, and almost the whole first semester is devoted to his works. The students are provided with a vocabulary for the major works and they cover selections from the lyrics, Evgenij Onegin, Boris Godunov, Mozart and Salieri, Skupoj Rytsar', and Mednyj Vsadnik.

Tolstoj and Dostoevskij. Since it is almost impossible to ask undergraduates who have begun Russian in college to read and discuss at length the major novels of Tolstoj and Dostoevskij, their works are given in English almost everywhere. Only at Brooklyn College are majors obliged to study them in Russian. Columbia, Stanford, Harvard, and Middlebury require of majors a one-semester course on Tolstoj and Dostoevskij, and Indiana University makes it optional for majors. Only Brooklyn, Smith, and Vassar devote a whole semester to each of these writers. At Vassar these courses, which are obligatory for majors, include Tolstoj's Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth; The Cossacks; The Sevastopol Tales; War and Peace; Anna Karenina; The Death of Ivan Ilich; The Power of Darkness; Master and Man, and some other short stories and plays, and Dostoevskij's Poor Folk, Notes from Underground, Crime and Punishment, The Idiot, The Possessed, and The Brothers Karamazov.

It has been our experience at Vassar that both Tolstoj and Dostoevskij are so universal and at the same time so Russian, they are so deep and have so many facets to their creative works, that even a semester is hardly enough to give an adequate presentation of either of them. In order to have the students understand the works in context, discussion of the works themselves is supplemented with information on the classes of Russian society, the Russian Orthodox Church, serfdom, the Westernizers and Slavophiles, the revolutionary movements, the Narodniks, etc.

Other specialized courses. In addition to courses on Tolstoj, Dostoevskij, and Puškin, colleges and universities offer a variety of specialized courses on such subjects as

Russian poetry, the drama, Soviet literature, the Silver Age, etc. Some survey courses cover old Russian literature and literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but a knowledge of these periods is not usually required of majors.

Aside from literature courses, universities tend to require courses in linguistics. At Cornell, Brown, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, the undergraduate major is required to take one semester of the history of the language. At Pennsylvania the student must have an advanced course in phonetics. The Universities of Indiana and Southern California at Los Angeles require 3 credit hours in the literatures of other Slavic languages. Several universities demand knowledge of a second Slavic language. Harvard requires 8 semester hours in another Slavic language or in a related subject; the universities of Indiana and Washington in Seattle, a second Slavic language; and Barnard and Oregon, a second foreign language. Wayne University offers 2 types of major, either with a second Slavic language or another modern foreign language, the requirement ranging from 6 to 12 credits at the student's discretion.

Requirements Outside the Russian Department. At some universities and colleges, the majors are required to take courses outside the department. The most common requirement is for at least one semester of Russian history, and sometimes one semester of Russian civilization, geography, economics, or the government of the Soviet Union. Russian majors tend increasingly to correlate their programs either with interdepartmental studies in comparative literature or with Soviet area studies. Soviet and Russian area courses still tend to stress the Soviet period, with little attention to the thousand years of Russian history and development before 1917. As our informational courses in the social sciences improve, we may hope that the assumption that Russia was a barbarous country before the Revolution may be dispelled once and for all.

Senior examinations. The most usual type of examination is a comprehensive examination, written in English, covering the literature courses and other related subjects, especially history. Some require translation to and from Russian and a short composition in Russian. Very few test speaking ability.

In most cases a senior paper in English is obligatory for those taking honors. A long senior paper is required at Yale,

Vassar, and Oregon, although they have no "honors" programs. Cornell requires a thesis on linguistics for honors; Harvard, a 10,000-word paper in English. Bryn Mawr and Haverford require, for honors, a senior paper either on a literary topic or in the field of the social sciences. So far as I have been able to discover, no college requires a long senior paper written in Russian.

Most institutions either offer seminars for their majors or prepare them for the senior examinations by individual studies which count three or four credits or the full value of a semester course.

At Vassar, the student has the choice of either writing a long paper in Russian or in English or of translating a book of over 100 pages into English. One of our students translated some of the Onežskie Skazki, Zajcev's Youth, others Bulgakov's Fatal Eggs and Krypton's Siege of Lenin-grad, which the author utilized in the English edition of the book. Other works which have been translated include Solov'ev's Three Speeches in Memory of Dostoevskij. A Czech student made a study of the correspondence of Tolstoj and Masaryk. Another major interviewed ten recent refugees who had settled in the Poughkeepsie area (a valuable utilization of her spoken Russian) and tried to reach general conclusions as to their attitudes and adjustment to a new life. Some students have done literary studies on such subjects as Shakespeare's influence on Puškin or Dostoevskij's methods; others have written on political subjects, using Russian-language material as the primary source.

A comprehensive examination should presumably cover the whole program of Russian literature, depending on the contents of the courses offered and possibly including history. The examination might be written in English, but it seems preferable to have some of the more complicated questions in English and shorter ones in Russian, requiring answers in the respective languages.

Besides the comprehensive examination there should be a test of language skills, which should presumably include a passage of literary criticism to be translated into English, or the candidate should be asked to make an abstract of an article. The students' active knowledge of Russian might be tested by a translation of a passage from English into Russian, aimed to test the vocabulary gained and correct usage of the language at the end of three or four years of

study. A short original composition might serve as an alternative.

It seems desirable also to test the speaking ability in the senior examination. A possible procedure would be to prepare cards with questions or discussion topics, let the student think over the topic for a brief period and then let him talk for at least a quarter of an hour without interruption. Or the examination could be conducted by several shorter questions and answers.

Conclusion

What are the problems we have on our hands? We have to be realistic and to develop our departments in the framework of the particular situation peculiar to each college. Each institution has its own academic policy and, as the Russian proverb says, you do not enter a monastery with your own rules. There are institutions, for instance, at which it is the unofficial policy of the Curriculum Committee not to allow more than one course given in translation in any language department. We teachers are faced with the dilemma of developing our departments and of keeping our requirements on the level of the other language departments (since we claim that Russian is no harder than Latin or German, to say nothing of Greek), in spite of the fact that students come to us with no knowledge whatsoever of the language. Not only do we have to take our majors from people who have started Russian in college, but we cannot even count on recruiting them from students who have started Russian as freshmen. We are obliged to allow sophomores enrolled in the elementary course to become majors. It is possible to remedy the situation as we do at Vassar by having at least 6 class hours per week, 8 semester credit hours for 2 semesters of work, on the elementary level, and a minimum of 5 hours on the intermediate level with 10 credits for the year, or have very intensive courses, as at Yale.

Since the introduction of concentration programs is beginning to increase and develop at the present time, it would seem apropos to discuss the possibility for the profession to recommend certain criteria and uniformity of requirements. Russian studies are so new in American colleges that students are likely to approach them in a spirit of adventure, and it is up to us to give them enough enthusiasm to become majors. At Vassar with a student body of 1,476 girls we

have gone as high as 6 seniors majoring in Russian. On the average, we have 2 or 3 each year. There are some colleges which limit the number of majors. In the case of Barnard, there are only 3 majors a year. It would seem undesirable to limit the number of majors, because the more American undergraduates learn about Russia, the more they will understand the Russian people and their problems. A nation that has given to the common treasury of civilization Tolstoj and Dostoevskij and has survived all the calamities of our tragic history has some spiritual and moral values worth knowing and we teachers have a mission to fulfill.²

Notes

1. The institutions included in this study are the following: Barnard, Beloit, Boston University, Brooklyn, Bryn Mawr, California University (Berkeley, Los Angeles), Columbia General Studies, Connecticut College, Cornell, Dartmouth, Fordham, Harvard, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Middlebury, Missouri, Mt. Holyoke, Northwestern, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State, Pembroke (Brown University), Smith, Southern California in Los Angeles, Stanford, Washington (Seattle), Wayne, Wisconsin, Vassar, and Yale. Quarter hours have been converted to semester hours.

2. This article is based upon a paper read at the annual convention of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, held at Washington, D. C., December 28-30, 1956.

REVIEWS

L. Sadnik and R. Aitzetmüller. Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten. Heidelberg and 's-Gravenhage: Carl Winter and Mouton & Co., 1955. xx, 341 pp.

Until the publication of this work, there has been no comprehensive Old Church Slavonic (OCS) dictionary, but only dictionaries of individual larger manuscripts (except Codex Zographensis and Assemanianus). Sadnik-Aitzetmüller's dictionary gives for the first time a cumulative vocabulary of eighteen OCS manuscripts. The choice of the manuscripts follows the suggestions made by J. Kurz for the OCS dictionary of the Czech Academy of Sciences. It includes seven major manuscripts (Codex Zographensis, Codex Marianus, Codex Assemanianus, Psalterium Sinaiticum, Euchologium Sinaiticum, Codex Supraliensis and Savvina Kniga) and a number of the most significant short texts or fragments. The Ostromir Gospel with its Russicisms and the Freising Fragments with its Slovenianisms are, as might be expected, not included.

The work consists of three parts: the dictionary proper, a "backwards dictionary," and the etymologies. In the dictionary proper, the OCS words transcribed in the Latin script are translated into German. It is understandable that in a dictionary of so many different sources with greatly varying orthography, the citation forms had to be standardized. This has been done on the etymological principle; e.g., v'dova 'widow' and v'dova are listed under v'dova (cf. Goth. widuwō; tēs'n 'narrow' is given under tēs'n, etc. The gender of the nouns is given, and the conjugation of the verbs is indicated. Unfortunately the aspect of the verbs has not been marked, a fault found even in several textbooks (e.g., Diels, Slon'ski). An especially good feature of the dictionary is that after each word all the manuscripts are given in which the word occurs. Thus the distribution of the words appears with great clarity. Sometimes the listings of the sources are, however, not quite complete. For instance, ej 'yes, indeed' and ijudej 'Jew' occur also in the Savvina Kniga; rana 'wound' appears many times also in Psalterium Sinaiticum, etc. The authors' thoroughness appears from the fact that even the misprints in the manuscripts are corrected (see, for instance, sub tēs'n and v'zběšati). It may be mentioned in passing that the mistake in the use of instr. kuriejō instead of dat. kuriniju 'Quirinius,' which the editors attribute to the Savvina Kniga, occurs actually in Codex Assemanianus.

The second part of the work, in which the words are arranged alphabetically starting from the end of the word, is helpful for the study of word formation.

In the last part the OCS words are arranged etymologically into groups; the etymology of each group is discussed and the most important bibliography given. For the etymologies the authors are greatly indebted to the etymological dictionaries of Slavic languages, especially

to Vasmer, and also to numerous periodical articles. Since no etymological dictionary of OCS has been published so far, the etymological notes given by Sadnik-Aitzetmüller are very helpful. In sum, the work is an important practical aid both for the teachers and for more advanced students of Slavic languages.

Felix J. Oinas
Indiana University

Anthology of Old Russian Literature. Ed. Ad. Stender-Petersen
in collaboration with Stefan Congrat-Butlar. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954. xxiv, 542, \$8.50.

A reviewer does not often have the opportunity to report on such an outstanding contribution to Slavic Studies in Anglo-Saxon countries as the Anthology of Old Russian Literature edited by the eminent Danish scholar, Ad. Stender-Petersen. The taste displayed by the editor in his selection of texts, painstaking editorial work, an attractive presentation and the book's excellent scholarly treatment will not only contribute to the study of ancient Russian letters in this country, but will also help many American students to enjoy reading early Russian literary works. The editor's selection of the texts was determined by their purely aesthetic value, and therefore this anthology differs from others based primarily on historical or philological considerations. In order to facilitate reading and enjoyment of the selections, Prof. Stender-Petersen has replaced the Old Slavonic letters by Russian, has expanded the abbreviations and corrected the errors of scribes. This method of editing will perhaps be disapproved by some linguistic purists, but will be greeted enthusiastically by students and readers since it considerably simplifies the reading and aesthetic appreciation of ancient Russian writers. For convenience and emphasis of literary peculiarities the editor has further divided the selections into chapters, has paragraphed direct speech and separated syntactical units. Poetic works or parts are presented in rhythmic units and printed in verse form. Professor Stender-Petersen has provided each selection with a literary-historical introduction, commentary, the basic forms of difficult words and a generous number of footnotes. Indices, genealogical tables, and a carefully compiled glossary of Church Slavonic words which are usually not included in standard Russian-English dictionaries also contribute to the usefulness of this new publication.

Many of the texts included in this Anthology cannot be found either in pre-revolutionary Russian or Soviet anthologies, and have previously been published only in very rare editions. Among these are the beautiful prayers of Kirill of Turov, Kiprian's life of Metropolitan Petr, and the Life of Bojarina Morozova, otherwise available only in a restricted edition. All of the texts have been edited in the light of modern scholarly research; for instance, in treating the Slovo o polku Igoreve the editor took into consideration Professor Roman Jakobson's recently published research on this great Russian epic.

While the editorial and textual contents of the Anthology call for very little criticism, some historical annotations might lead to misunderstanding or disagreement. The reader will probably be astonished to find that the accounts of Prince Oleg's campaign, based

according to the editor's own annotation on a Byzantine-Mediterranean motif, are qualified as Varangian sagas. The statement that Avvakum's Life is the first Russian autobiography can also be contested since it was preceded by Monk Epifanij's Life and some even earlier works in the same genre by Muscovite writers. Paxomij Logofet's authorship of the Legend of the Princes of Vladimir is rather doubtful, and Prof. Stender-Petersen's statement that the flowery panegyric style was developed primarily by Paxomij Logofet can hardly withstand historical criticism, since his predecessor, Epifanij the Wise, was earlier instrumental in spreading the pletentie sloves in Russia. Metropolitan Kiprian's role in the popularization of this style in Muscovite Russia also should not be forgotten.

Such controversial statements, however, are not very numerous and can hardly destroy the superior general impression produced by this Columbia University Press publication.

Serge A. Zenkovsky
Harvard University

Horace G. Lunt. Old Church Slavonic Grammar. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1955. xiv, 143 pp.

This third volume of the Leiden Slavistic Printings and Reprintings is the first systematic presentation of Old Church Slavonic in English. Long overdue, it is no hasty compilation or adaptation of an older foreign-language text: Professor Lunt has obviously spent years in patient research in the preparation of this volume. The first two chapters, introducing and summarizing the history and alphabet of OCS, present an excellent analysis of many long-debated questions in the field. As is to be expected, the Grammar presupposes the knowledge of at least one Slavic language on the part of the student. This will, at least partially, obviate for the beginner in Slavic philology, the need of knowing German or French.

Three chapters cover the sound system, the declension, and the conjugation of OCS, and a fourth gives a sketchy outline of syntax.

The author's approach to OCS phonology and grammar is structural, and thus it departs basically from the traditional historical-comparative treatments (like those of Leskien, Kul'bakin, Diels, Vaillant, etc.). Keeping in mind the classroom purpose of his text, the author has included many summary tables. In addition, his lists of specialized verbs is recommendable for mnemotechnic purposes. His arrangement is certainly easier to follow than the usual Anmerkungen or Bemerkungen of Diels or Leskien, or the cursive paragraph comments of Vaillant. It seems regrettable that the book devotes no space to the non-inflected grammatical categories, such as prepositions, conjunctions, and adverbs.

The material is so arranged as to facilitate easy cross-reference. The book is on the whole well edited, though there are occasional lapses, such as the numerical jump from 3.4214 to 4.4213, and then back to 4.00 on page 42. A distinct advantage could also have resulted from the inclusion of sample texts.

All in all, the book is a valuable contribution to Slavic Studies in the United States. Slavic scholars and students can also be thankful

to Professor Cornelis H. van Schooneveld of Leiden University, the capable and energetic editor of this series.

W. C. Jaskiewicz
Fordham University

B. O. Unbegaun. Russian Versification. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956. xiv, 164, 25s.

This compact volume is a masterpiece of clarity and precision; it is always succinct and at the same time surprisingly comprehensive. The problems of organization confronting a critic who proposes to present an introduction to the versification of any given literature by describing all its basic features in historical perspective and by formulating its basic problems, would seem insurmountable. Prof. Unbegaun has succeeded with real virtuosity on this score; his arrangement and his selection and emphasis of the material involved is superb. To my knowledge this book is unique even among the various existing studies written in Russian. No single study covers so much ground with such brevity and accuracy.

It has always been my opinion that Mirsky's History of Russian Literature is unique among works of comparable scope in any language, treating of any literature, both in its general excellence of presentation and in its uniformly high level of criticism. Perhaps the same can be said of Prof. Unbegaun's Russian Versification. Once again students of Russian literature are singularly fortunate in having a work of such unusual quality, and once again that work is written in English.

One special feature which helps the organization of the book is its system of cross-referencing. Although the rhythm of presentation is fairly inexorable, there are complete accompanying references to the handling of problems, which, at any given point, might occur to the reader, but which logically are given subsequent development.

There are several minor points with which I find I might take exception. In his general remarks on binary metres (pp. 38-39), Prof. Unbegaun mentions that the inversion of the first foot of an iambic line can be effected by means of a trochaic substitution. This is a fairly common feature, provided the first syllable of the line is an accented monosyllable. The author asserts that the first word may also be a disyllable. It is unfortunate that he provides no more convincing an example of this than a weak verse from I. Dolgorukij. And it appears even more probable that the author is not completely convinced of the possibility of this variation, when he, quite rightly, discusses some verses of Marina Cvetaeva (p. 94) under marginal phenomena, which reflect the transition from syllabic-accentual verse to a pure accentual type. The verses cited are composed of a fixed trimeter line in which the first foot is a trochee and the last two iambs.

The verses of Brjusov (p. 71), which the author presents to illustrate the "sterile quality" of internal rhyme, which is not accompanied by a caesura, to my ear at least, would seem to prove that the poet has been most successful in creating a caesura in a binary metre, where word-boundary and foot-ending do not coincide. It is true the first line is forced. However, because of the parallel constructions

and the syntactic pauses in the third and fourth lines, it seems most improbable that the listener would fail to catch the internal rhymes, the typographical spacing to the contrary notwithstanding.

I also find it difficult to agree with the assertion (p. 127) that "indeed, whether the syllable is stressed or not, i. e., long or short, it always accounts for half a foot in binary metres and a third in ternary metres, neither more nor less. Such treatment tends to some extent to eliminate differences in quantity, very marking in prose, between stressed and unstressed syllables, thus infringing the autonomy of the word."

The magnificent passage of *enjambements* quoted from Puškin's *Mednyj vsadnik* (p. 124) are accused of "artificiality." Nor does the subsequent justification of their "jerky rhythm" in terms of content give any account of the brilliant technical fluency of this "rhythmic trick."

The diacritical markings in the many scansion patterns presented and the careful accentuation of the Russian texts must have involved most careful proofreading. A few unimportant errors in this regard in no way impugn the fact that the text has been edited with the utmost care. For example, on page 14, line 2, it is clear that one should read "trochaic" and not "iambic" as printed; and on page 41, line 4, an extra dash should be added to indicate the fourth syllable in the schematized illustration of the first paeonic foot.

The importance of Prof. Unbegaun's contribution to the literature on Russian verse cannot be overpraised. And it should be emphasized that its interest will not be restricted to specialists alone. *Russian Versification* is written in such a lucid and absorbing manner that the average student of Russian literature will surely come to regard it as a standard reference work, in which he will find an answer for most, if not all, of his queries.

Richard Burgi
Yale University

The Selected Letters of Anton Chekhov. Edited with an Introduction by Lillian Hellman. Translated by Sidonie K. Lederer. New York: Farrar, Straus and Company [1955]. xxix, 331, \$4.00.

From the more than four thousand letters written by Čexov and published in Russian, the editor of *The Selected Letters of Anton Chekhov* has chosen a few hundred for the American edition. Many of the letters have been translated before, especially those where Čexov expresses his views on literature or his philosophy of life, but the reader will also find much heretofore untranslated material, which shows other aspects of Čexov's character. The chronological order in which the letters appear is helpful in showing the growth of the author and the development of his ideas.

No two persons would make the same selection from the thousands of available letters, but as a whole the editor has made an excellent choice. The book is divided into three periods: 1885-1890, 1890-1897, and 1897-1904. In a few pages preceding each group of letters the editor summarises the events of Čexov's life during those years. This is an excellent device and clarifies many points which otherwise

would have to be mentioned in footnotes. It seems to me, however, that the value of these summaries would have been enhanced if mention had been made of at least some of the stories he wrote in each period. After all, Čexov's correspondence interests us primarily because he was a great writer, and this aspect of his life has been neglected in the summaries. Most of his plays are mentioned, but only because their performance forms part of his biography.

In an excellent introduction the editor outlines Čexov's personality and his attitude towards the society in which he lived. Although her evaluation of Čexov's character is sometimes subjective, as a whole her conclusions are well documented and fair. Perhaps more factual material about the social and cultural history of Russia at the end of the nineteenth century would have been helpful for the American reader. But clearly space was limited and the occasional notes in the text explain what is unfamiliar.

The letters are well and fairly accurately translated. Perhaps it is impossible to express in English the exact colloquial flavor of Čexov's style. I have seen no translation yet in which the English does not seem somewhat stilted.

What I have criticised are only minor flaws and detract but slightly from the value of these letters for all those who love Čexov's stories and plays. The personality of the author, who hid himself so completely behind the characters of his works, comes to life in his letters. After reading what he wrote to his friends and relatives, you feel that Čexov has become a personal friend, whose every mood is known to you, whose loves and hatreds you share. And, even more important, the Russia of more than fifty years ago is resurrected in these letters. We see the countryside and the cities through the eyes of the author, we live in the same social and cultural environment. This background, which is the same as that in his stories and plays, becomes real and vivid. And in this way the letters contribute greatly to a better and deeper understanding of Čexov, the author.

It is to be hoped that a second volume of Čexov's letters will some day be published in English. A great amount of material, of equal beauty and interest, still remains untranslated and those who love Čexov will undoubtedly ask for more.

Frances de Graaff
Bryn Mawr College

Eugene Pyziur. The Doctrine of Anarchism of Michael A. Bakunin. Marquette Slavic Studies, I. Milwaukee, Wisc.: The Marquette University Press, 1955. ix, 155, paper \$3.00, cloth \$4.20.

Dr. Eugene Pyziur's attractive little book presents a detailed and painstaking account of Michael Bakunin's social and political teaching, especially as it centered on his doctrine of the revolution. The author emphasizes correctly that Bakunin left no complete and connected exposition of his views, and that his ideology has to be pieced together from numerous, often fragmentary, sources. Dr. Pyziur succeeds on the whole in accomplishing this task: he gathers his material well, organizes it clearly, analyzes it with skill, and presents it in general in a convincing manner. The author

demonstrates thorough knowledge of Bakunin's own writings, and he discusses lucidly and with a sense of proportion the impacts of such varied thinkers as Konstantin Aksakov, Weitling, Lelewel, Hegel, Proudhon, and Marx on the famous Russian anarchist. Dr. Pyziur also delights in drawings interesting and far-reaching parallels between Bakunin and the Bolsheviks; he escapes possible criticism by explaining late in the book that these similarities do not indicate any major direct influence (pp. 147-148). Most of the author's main contentions, notably his conviction that Bakunin's methods were bound to destroy his ends, have excellent supporting evidence. The writing is satisfactory, except for occasional awkward sentences.

The main weaknesses of Dr. Pyziur's study appear to stem from his eagerness to achieve his purpose, that is, to present a full, reasoned and logical doctrine of Bakuninism. More attention might have been paid to the late Professor Joseph Schumpeter's statement quoted on page 134: "the classics of anarchism . . . avoided errors of reasoning largely by avoiding reasoning." As it is, Dr. Pyziur's presentation of Bakunin's views is at times too pat and tidy. Thus, Dr. Pyziur does not distinguish sufficiently between Bakunin's deepest beliefs and his more superficial intellectual acquisitions, even though he recognizes the fact that most of Bakunin's teaching was borrowed *ad hoc* from such contemporaries as Proudhon and even Marx. The author also fails to make the necessary allowance for Bakunin's extremely unbalanced and disorganized personality, in spite of the assertion in the first chapter that Bakunin's "own temperament was basic." "Of course, like everyone else, he was shaped by his epoch, but in his case, external factors played a relatively secondary role" (p. 5). For example, Dr. Pyziur sees the "final causes" of Bakunin's vaunted atheism in his conviction that the doctrine of immortality makes man self-sufficient and separates him from his fellow-men, and in his "desire to achieve a unity of theory and practice, of fact and value, of thought and action, within the reality of a given historical social order" (pp. 52-53). It seems more likely, however, that Bakunin assailed God in the same basic and blind manner in which he attacked all terrestrial authority. Or, again, Dr. Pyziur notes Bakunin's strange predilection for conflagrations, in particular the revolutionary burning of all documents and files; then he explains it by the anarchist's desire to counteract the fetishistic mentality of Russian peasants (pp. 105-106).

But, everything considered, Dr. Pyziur's book deserves commendation. It represents a good piece of work neatly done. Students of Slavic culture will look forward to other monographs which will presumably follow this inaugural volume of Marquette Slavic Studies.

Nicholas V. Riasanovsky
State University of Iowa

George Heard Hamilton. The Art and Architecture of Russia.
Penguin Books, 1954. 320 pp., \$8.50.

This recent addition to the Pelican History of Art helps fill an acknowledged void in works in the English language. The word "help" is used in deference to the earnest efforts of Professor Hamilton, who

is Associate Professor of Art at Yale University and Curator of Modern Art and of the Abbey Collection there. The weakness of the book, it seems to me, lies in the book's confining itself too much to being "a history of the formal structure of a national art," and allowing too little space and attention to criticism of Russian art. This limitation was obviously imposed upon Professor Hamilton against his will, by the editors of the Pelican Series. Professor Hamilton begins with an apology in the foreword, indicating that he had hoped that the editor of the series would permit verification of his hypotheses relating to Russian art, through examination of significant works. However, it becomes clear in the work that not only was there little or no space assigned for such criticism, but that significant compilations of arts such as *Istoriia Russkogo Iskusstva*, Volume I (1953) and Volume II (1953), published by the Academy of Sciences, were not even made available to him.

The work treats the history of architecture and art in western Russia, in chronological fashion, beginning with Kiev in the tenth century, and carrying the reader to the beginning of the present century. The lengthy, detailed notes are helpful. The volume is rounded out with 180 pages of plates.

The volume begins auspiciously, but the reader soon begins to wait impatiently for a discussion of painting other than icon-painting. And as the book nears its end, earlier fears that other art would be relegated to comparatively few pages are only too well justified. Thus Romanticism is confined to eight pages, Realism to ten pages, and the Slavic Revival and *Mir Iskusstva* to thirteen pages. On the whole, the criticisms which the author allows himself are penetrating, though one may be a little distressed at some specific criticisms, such as that Repin was undisturbed by psychological penetration—a conclusion which hardly seems tenable, when one considers the famous painting of *Mussorgskij* and the portraits of Tolstoj.

Thus, despite some shortcomings, the book will serve a useful purpose, particularly for students interested in Russian architecture and icon-painting, and who do not know Russian.

Fan Parker
Brooklyn College

Joseph Reményi. *Three Hungarian Poets, Balint Balassa, Miklós Zrínyi, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz*. Washington, D.C.: The Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, 1955. 64 pp.

The author, late professor of comparative literature at Western Reserve University, entitled his work *Three Hungarian Poets*, and we would expect the short book to be only a literary appraisal of the three poets. But it is more than that, for the author depicts also the cultural, social, and political background of these poets, and thus the work is in fact a very interesting selected reading of Hungarian history.

Bálint Balassa lived in the sixteenth century, which is one of the most tragic epochs of Hungarian history. The Hungarians were defeated by the Turks and the whole country was in a turmoil. Balassa himself took part in military campaigns and fought against the Turks.

His poetry reflects the mood of that agitated age. Miklós Zrínyi wrote in the seventeenth century, while the Turkish-Hungarian wars were still being waged. He was a great patriot, political and military leader, political writer, and poet. His *magnum opus* is an epic: *Szigetvár ostroma* (The Siege of Szigetvár). His lyrical poems, too, are a valuable contribution to Hungarian literature. The eighteenth century is the historical background of the third poet, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz. The country is liberated from the Turks, but is suffering from the after-effects of the long wars. Csokonai Vitéz is one of the foremost poets of that century. He took initiative in reviving literary activity in Hungary.

The author's appraisal of the three poets and their background is vivid and interesting. He frequently gives samples of the English translation of their poems with the warning, however, that even "the best translation is necessarily a compromise."

A. C. Varga
Fordham University

Eduard Beneš. *Memoirs of Eduard Beneš*. Translated by Godfrey Lias. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1954. xi, 346, \$7.50.

This is a translation of the first of the three volumes which Eduard Beneš, the late President of Czechoslovakia, intended to write after his return to his homeland in 1945. The communist coup d'état of 1948, followed closely by his premature death, prevented him from completing his work.

The present volume first came out in 1947, when the ailing President was in the midst of a struggle for the preservation of democracy in a once free and independent country. This fact is reflected throughout the entire book, which can hardly be regarded as memoirs in the usual sense of the word. Its main purpose was not to provide detached testimony on past events, but to serve as a weapon in a struggle which was still going on.

Having secured the reconstruction of Czechoslovakia, Eduard Beneš was confronted with an equally difficult task—the saving of his country from its own ally, the Soviet Union, and from the rapaciousness of Communism. Thus his *Memoirs* were to serve a dual purpose. They gave the Czechoslovak people an account of the war-time activities of the government in exile; at the same time, they laid down in detail what Eduard Beneš regarded as circumstances and conditions of co-operation between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

In his book Eduard Beneš, an ardent adherent of Western democracy, appears to be a loyal and genuine friend of Russia. He praises its attitude during the Munich crisis and remains apparently unperturbed by its *rapprochement* with Germany after August 1939. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, Beneš re-established the pre-war friendship with the Soviet Union, and he returned from his 1943 visit to Moscow with "unforgettable impressions" which further confirmed his faith in his ally.

The *Memoirs* provide an explanation of Beneš' motivation. It must be sought not only in the tragic experience of Munich but also in the old Czech sympathies for Russia, traditionally regarded as a bulwark against the German *Drang nach Osten*. But Beneš never intended to divorce his nation from the West. He thought of the future

Czechoslovak-Soviet co-operation only within a broader framework of a more general European understanding. In fact, Eduard Beneš, like many others, regarded Czechoslovakia as a "test case" of the intentions of the Soviet Union with regard to its smaller neighbors (p. 275). The success of Czechoslovak-Soviet co-operation, he believed, was dependent on the capability of mutual adaptation between the Soviet and Western systems. He was convinced that such accommodation, resulting in peaceful coexistence of the East and West, was both possible and necessary.

Yet there is an undertone in his Memoirs which indicates the author's growing apprehension about Soviet intentions. As if endeavoring to recapture the war-time atmosphere of friendship and mutual respect, Eduard Beneš repeatedly refers to the duty of non-interference in other countries' internal affairs—a duty imposed by the 1943 Treaty of Alliance—and to the principle of good faith, by which he was guided. It is clear that at the time of his writing he was no longer certain that these feelings were ever reciprocated by his Soviet ally. In a significant footnote (p. 286) Beneš observes: "Was I mistaken either in my opinion or my expectation or was I not? Only the future can answer. Come what may, I was to the fullest possible extent sincere and honest in my belief."

In less than six months the Soviet Union and its Czechoslovak Communist henchmen gave a reply to Beneš' query. Czechoslovakia disappeared behind the Iron Curtain and became an integral part of the new Soviet colonial empire.

The Memoirs of Eduard Beneš are an important document for all students of the Soviet Union and its system. They provide invaluable evidence of the process which resulted in the Sovietization of East-Central Europe.

Václav Beneš
Indiana University

Nicholas Voinov. The Waif. New York: Pantheon Books, 1955.
292 pp., \$3.95.

The real story of the thousands of homeless children in the USSR in the late twenties and the thirties has never been revealed fully to the Western world, primarily because the story itself is one of failure on the part of the Soviet government to cope with the problems of juvenile delinquency and hooliganism. V. Ja. Šiškov, in his Children of Darkness (1931) portrayed many disturbing aspects of this life, but gave a somewhat distorted picture, partially through lack of understanding of these new problems, but perhaps even more because governmental policy compelled him to paint an idyllic picture of those institutions which were supposed to care for these children. However, even this work, which was intended to show how the Soviets were solving their problem, was never reprinted, since it admittedly portrays one of the seamy sides of Soviet life.

It is for this reason that N. Voinov's autobiography, The Waif, which describes his life amongst the homeless children from the age of six in 1929 when his father was purged until 1946 when he came to the United States is particularly valuable today. The first half of the

book tells the story of a small boy's existence in one of the sordid Children's Homes, of his escape, his life with an organized gang of waifs who like himself were forced to steal, and if necessary, to kill, in order to survive. Voinov carefully documents the changes that took place from year to year and points out that by 1937 the Children's Home in which he had once lived had changed considerably—and, as a matter of fact, corresponded to the descriptions given by Šiškov several years too soon. Children were now properly housed, and every effort was made to rehabilitate them, to make of them useful citizens of Soviet society. Some, like Voinov, went back to school, and even may have joined the Komsomol, but most of the old-timers (18-20 years of age) had simply become professional criminals.

The second half of the book is no longer the story of a waif, but the story of a young soldier whose interest in his motherland is aroused, who fights, is captured by the Germans, and who eventually manages to escape when the Allies invade Normandy. At this point he successfully evades repatriation, or capture and kidnapping by Soviet agents in Paris, and manages to escape to the USA. Although this second half is a very stirring account, it is much more ideological than the first part, and in this sense, perhaps, somewhat less objective. Under these circumstances it is quite understandable why the author hides behind a pseudonym.

It should be pointed out, however, that this is not merely another story of a Soviet citizen's flight to the West, but first and foremost a work of intrinsic literary value, and one which in its simplicity, directness, and effectiveness reminds one of Gorky's masterful Childhood. Here is a gripping adventure story which would make good reading even if it were not a true story. The Waif not only contributes to our information on life in the Soviet Union, but is a noteworthy addition to Russian autobiographical literature of the twentieth century.

Leon I. Twarog
Boston University

Jozef Lettrich. History of Modern Slovakia. New York: Frederick A. Praeger [c. 1955]. 329 pp. plus 24 pp. of illustrations, \$5.00.

Today, Slovakia constitutes an integral part of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, set up in 1918 on the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Czechoslovak statistics of 1945 estimated the total population of Slovakia as 3,500,000. While the history of the Slovak people is lost in legend and mythology, that of Slovakia as a separate state lies within the scope of a journalist's personal experience or a statesman's memoirs. It covers the period between Munich and the end of World War II.

Jozef Lettrich's History of Modern Slovakia is largely a documented report on the policies pursued by Slovak leaders imbued with political radicalism, anti-Semitism, autonomism, and separatism, resulting in the creation of a separate Slovak State as a satellite of the Nazi Reich. After a brief historical introduction in which he retraces Slovak history during the pre-Hungarian period, under the Magyars, and within the Czechoslovak republic, Lettrich gives a revealing account of the destinies of Slovakia under the Swastika, as

well as of resistance of Slovak patriots against German domination, and of the movement for reunion with the Czechs.

The author is particularly at home in the description of Nazi atrocities committed against the Slovak population and the account of the epic of resistance, for he was one of the organizers of the Czechoslovak anti-Nazi underground movement which culminated in the Slovak National Uprising of 1944-45. The material presented in these chapters is illustrated by photographic evidence. After the war, Lettrich became chairman of the legislative council of Slovakia, and he pursued the fight against the Communists as a member of the Czechoslovak Liberation Movement abroad, following the coup d'état of 1948. His experience of those years forms the substance of the concluding chapters of the book.

According to the author, the union between the Czechs and the Slovaks, both cultural and spiritual, has deep historical and political justification which not even separate historical development could suppress. By way of conclusion Lettrich offers a brief memoir in support of this thesis.

History of Modern Slovakia was written by a man who knows how to present objective evidence in a dignified but eloquent way but who never forgets that his task was that of a political fighter, not of a historian. The main text is accompanied by some forty-one documents and a useful bibliography. The book is well edited. The main asset of the book, however, lies in its scrupulous documentation.

Serge L. Levitsky
Fordham University

Attack from the Sea. MOSFILM, 1953, Russian-Language film with English subtitles.

The story, and there is much more plotting than plot, concerns the conquests of the Ionian Islands, Corfu, the liberation of Naples and Rome by the Russian Fleet under Admiral Ushakov some time back about 1810. This film and its predecessor, Ushakov, provide the Soviet public with a serialized bit of knight errantry that makes up in some degree for the lack of Hollywood western films in the land of the Bolsheviks. Cut up in weekly installments, it could keep the children shouting for many Saturdays as the hero knocks out one foe after another, and like the western cowboy our hero never kisses anybody but his horse (or some other male hero).

Aside from the action-packed scenario already described, Attack has some brilliant scenes of the Black Sea (Units of the Soviet Army and Fleet took part in the film), and the usual painstaking makeup of the historical characters. Dialogue is above average.

The student of Soviet propaganda will find this an interesting if somewhat obvious bit of brain-stuffing. For those who have not yet learned the lesson, it will make quite clear that historical accounts are no better than the persons who write them. The main thesis—Russia's allies have always given her the double cross—has worn a bit thin in recent years. Nevertheless, we could not help remembering that Soviet post-war history casts the Soviet Union's allies in exactly the same role as the British and the Central Powers are supposed to have played opposite Ushakov.

Claude P. Lemieux
U.S. Naval Academy

NEWS AND NOTES

Program of AATSEEL Fourteenth Annual Meeting

September 9-11, 1957

University of Wisconsin
212 Bascom Hall

Monday, September 9.

9:00-10:30 A.M. Literature Section. Chairman: Arthur P. Coleman, Alliance College.

1. "The Relations of Tolstoj and Turgenev," Edward Miček, Univ. of Texas. (20 minutes)
2. "The Impact of Russian Literature in the Near and Middle East," Ivar Spector, Univ. of Washington. (20 minutes)
3. "Puškin and the 'Tale of the Fisherman' in Russian and German Folklore," M.S. Mirski, U.S. Military Academy. (20 minutes)
4. "The Contemporary Serbian Novel," Vasa Mihailovich, Wayne State Univ. (20 minutes)

10:45-12:45. Literature Section. Chairman: William W. Langebartel, Temple Univ.

1. "Reflections of the Polish Drama," Marion Moore Coleman, Alliance College. (20 minutes)
2. "An Inimical Relationship: Dostoevskij and Turgenev," Fan Parker, Brooklyn College. (20 minutes)
3. "Russian and Polish Themes in Early American Opera," Lubov B. Keefer, The Johns Hopkins Univ. (20 minutes)
4. "Tolstoj and Sienkiewicz," Bronisław de L. Jezierski, Boston Univ. (20 minutes)

12:45-2:00 P.M. Executive Council Meeting. [92 Bascom Hall]

2:00-3:15. Methodology Section. Chairman: Rev. Walter C. Jaskevicz, S.J., Fordham Univ.

1. "Toward Free Control of Russian Speech Patterns," Thais S. Lindstrom, Montana State Univ. (20 minutes)
2. Panel discussion: "Methods of Teaching Slavic Literatures in Canadian Universities," Victor Litwinowicz, Carleton College; Jacques Montpetit, Univ. of Montreal. (25 minutes). To be followed by general discussion.

[3:45-5:15. MLA Slavic I: Literatures (Union Top Flight)]

Tuesday, September 10.

[9:00-10:30. MLA Slavic 2: Linguistics (Union Top Flight)]

10:45-12:15. Linguistics Section. Chairman: Zbigniew Folejewskij, Univ. of Wisconsin.

1. "Reflections on a Comparative Study of Slavic Numerals," Edmund S. Przybylski, Univ. of Wisconsin. (20 minutes)
2. "Reported Forms in Standard Bulgarian," Harold L. Klagstad, Indiana Univ. (20 minutes)
3. "The Etymological Composition of Russian," Felix Oinas, Indiana Univ. (20 minutes)
4. "A Progress Report on Mechanical Translation: Russian to English," Harry H. Josselson, Wayne State Univ. (15 minutes)

2:00-3:00. Annual Business Meeting.

Wednesday, September 11.

9:00-10:30. Joint session with the Eastern Canadian Assoc. of Slavic and East European Specialists. Chairman: Claude P. Lemieux, U.S. Naval Academy.

1. "The Catholicism of Norwid," Theodore F. Domaradzki, Univ. of Montreal. [In Polish with an English summary.] (25 minutes)
2. "Methodology of Research on Slavic Ethnic Groups in Canada," Vladimir G. Kaye, Univ. of Ottawa. (20 minutes)
3. "Problems in Slavistic Field Work in Canada and the USA," Jaroslav B. Rudnyckij, Univ. of Manitoba. (20 minutes)
4. "Catherine II's Reaction to Radishchev," Roderick P. Thaler, Bishop's Univ. (20 minutes)

10:30-12:00. Open.

Annual Meeting of New England Chapter

The annual meeting of the New England Chapter of the AATSEEL was held at the Phillips Brooks House, Harvard University, on April 13, 1957, following immediately the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Boston and Cambridge on April 12 and 13. This timing of the meeting gave the New England Chapter the opportunity to have as guests Slavists from universities and colleges of the entire East Coast. Forty members of the AATSEEL attended the meeting, representing Boston University, Harvard, Tufts, Wellesley, Smith, Regis, Emmanuel, Wheaton, Bowdoin, Bridgeport, Vassar, Temple, Allegheny, Ottawa, and Carleton.

Serge A. Zenkovsky, Chairman of the New England Chapter, opened the meeting with warm greetings to New England members and to guests from other universities and colleges.

Helen Muchnic of Smith College spoke on Vladimir Majakovskij as a poet of discord. She analysed some of the themes and formal elements of Majakovskij's poems as reflections of discords in his nature: clashes between will and feeling, between affirmation and denial, between his public and private selves.

Gerta Hüttl-Worth of Tufts University discussed the eighteenth century's contribution to Russian vocabulary. She showed how there

was an influx of foreign technical and scholarly terms under Peter the Great, how Russian equivalents for these terms were created during the following decades, and how literary Russian was enriched by new abstract substantives and semantic loans during the second half of the century. She pointed out that most lexical innovations are actually much older than is usually believed and that the importance of Karamzin's activity in this field has been greatly exaggerated.

Waclaw Jedrzejewicz of Wellesley College spoke on ideological trends in modern Polish literature limiting himself largely to a survey of recent Polish artistic publications. He showed some specimens of very beautifully published books, pointing out how a great part of them are devoted to the attempt to develop a cultural and political unit between Poland and the Soviet Union. Most of these books ignore the achievements of Polish cultural life during the twenty years of Polish independence between the wars and omit all names of Polish national heroes and leaders of that time.

The speeches were followed by animated discussions which continued into the refreshment period after the formal program.

In the business session, Waclaw Jedrzejewicz, Wellesley College was elected Chairman of the New England Chapter, and Valeria Turnina was re-elected Secretary-Treasurer for next year.

Valeria Turnina, Secretary-Treasurer
New England AATSEEL Chapter

Fall Meeting of New York Chapter

Thirty-four members and guests attended the thirteenth annual fall conference meeting of the New York Chapter of the AATSEEL, in Dickenson Hall, Princeton University, on Saturday afternoon, November 17, 1956.

Welcomes to Slavists from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were given by Professor Catherine Wolkonsky of Vassar College, President of the New York Chapter, and also by Professor Herbert Wade, representing the Department of Foreign Languages of Princeton University, and Professor Ludmilla Turkevich, Chairman of the Department of Russian at Princeton.

Rev. Walter Jaskiewicz, S. J., Director of the Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies, Fordham University, gave a report on AATSEEL activities and plans during his presidency in 1956, and he also summarized the highlights of his visit during summer 1956 to various Slavic centers in France, Munich, Italy, Graz, Austria, and to the School of Slavonic Studies in London. He spoke of Europeans' high regard for Slavic specialists in America and for the research being done here.

Mr. Henry Wilmarth Mott III of Colgate University gave a talk on the subject "The Teaching of the Russian Language in American Secondary Schools." He listed the small number of secondary schools which now offer Russian, and he emphasized the desirability of increasing this number.

Two instructors of high-school Russian, Mr. Albert Neitz of the Riverdale Schools and Mr. Thomas Reilly of the Horace Mann School, New York City, spoke of the various problems they have had to cope with in teaching Russian on the secondary level, including the finding of proper grammars, readers, and methodology.

Professor Cyril Black, Professor of Russian History at Princeton, and Professor Fan Parker, Brooklyn College, reported on their visits to the Soviet Union in summer 1956. Professor Black presented a series of color slides and talked about his Russian impressions. Professor Parker, who spent a month in the Soviet Russia, described the educational system in Moscow, noting how the study of foreign language begins in the fifth class and how plans for the study of foreign languages are greatly expanding in Russia.

The business session was opened with the report of the Chapter Secretary, Dr. S. J. Sluska, on the status of the membership of the Chapter and on plans for two annual meetings. It was decided to have the Spring 1957 meeting at Hunter College. A Findings Committee was named to investigate the accreditation of Slavic Languages by the College Entrance Board and other boards, and to report at the April meeting. Dr. Filia Holtzman, Brooklyn College, was appointed to cover the colleges, Mr. Albert Neitz, the private secondary schools, and Miss Maria Nowosielska, St. Peter's College, the high schools. The following Chapter officers for 1957 were elected: Professor Wolonsky of Vassar, President; Dr. Albert Parry of Colgate, Professor Olga Woronoff of Manhattanville College, and Dr. Filia Foltzman of Brooklyn College, Vice Presidents, to represent upper, central, and metropolitan New York, respectively; Dr. Sluska was re-elected Secretary-Treasurer.

The conference adjourned for an hour of hospitality given by Drs. John and Ludmilla Turkevich, where the AATSEELers were delighted to find in attendance Mr. George B. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Mr. Kennan participated in the general conversation about Soviet Russia and also the problems of Slavic instructors in the U.S.A.

S. J. Sluska, Secretary-Treasurer
New York AATSEEL Chapter

Ivan Franko Exhibit

The hundredth anniversary of the birth of Ivan Franko (1856-1916), one of the Ukraine's greatest poets, writers, and thinkers, was commemorated by an exhibition in the Monterey, California, Public Library from December 26, 1956 to January 31, 1957. The exhibit contained books in the Ukrainian, English, German, and other languages, as well as a portrait of Franko. All materials exhibited were loaned by Dr. Yar Slavutych of the Ukrainian Department of the U.S. Army Language School.

TRANSLITERATION

The following transliteration system will be used in this Journal for transliterating Cyrillic:

А а	а	Ј ј	ј	Ч ч	ч
Б б	б	К к	к	Ц ц	(SC, M) dž
В в	в	Ќ к	к	Ш ш	š
Г г	(U, BR) g	Л л	l	Щ щ	(B, SC) št (all others) t
Г г	(U, BR) h (all others) g	Љ љ	(SC, M) lj	Ъ ъ	(B) ə (all others)
Ґ ғ	(M) ğ	М м	m	Ы ы	y
Д д	d	Н н	n	Ь ь	'
Ђ ђ	(SC) dj	Њ њ	(SC, M) nj	Ѣ ѣ	ě
Е е	e	О о	o	Э э	è
Ё ё	ë	П п	p	Ю ю	ju
Є є	(U) je	Р р	r	Я я	ja
Ј ј	(SC) je	С с	s	Ѧ Ѧ	f
Ж ж	ž	Т т	t	Ѣ Ѣ	i
З з	z	Ѧ Ѧ	(SC) é	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) ě
Ѕ ѕ	(M, CS) dz	У у	u	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) jě
И и	(U) y (all others) i	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) u	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) o (B) ə
І і	i	Ѧ Ѧ	(BR) w	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) o (B) ə
Ї ї	(U) ji	Ѧ Ѧ	f	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) o (B) ə
Й й	j	Ѧ Ѧ	x	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) o (B) ə
		Ѧ Ѧ	c	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) o (B) ə

B — Bulgarian	R — Russian
BR — Belorussian	SC — Serbo-Croatian
CS — Church Slavonic	U — Ukrainian
M — Macedonian	

This system will be used consistently, with the following exceptions:

1. Anglicized words such as ruble, kopek, kolkhoz, sovkhov, Bolshevik, soviet, calash, troika, tsar, boyar, droshky (these spellings will be used, except in linguistic or quoted Cyrillic text, in which case the words will be transliterated according to the table above).
2. The names of individuals who have accepted a Latin-alphabet spelling (e.g., Mirsky).
3. Bibliographical references to materials published in non-Cyrillic languages (e.g., The Letters of Chekhov, as the title of the English-language publication only).
4. Geographical names in widely accepted usage in Anglicized spelling (e.g., Yalta, Moscow).